## December 21, 2023, Formal Hearing ND PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Good afternoon. everyone. This is a formal hearing on the Summit Carbon pipeline case. And I'm Randy Christmann, chair of the STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION Commission, joined by Commissioner Sheri Haugen-Hoffart and independent decisionmaker and judge Tim Dawson. SCS Carbon Transport LLC 6 Just a couple comments I want to make before we Midwest Carbon Express CO2 Project Siting Application CO2 Pipeline get started because there are some distinctions between 8 what you've seen in the past in this case and today. TRANSCRIPT OF FORMAL HEARING December 21, 2023 9 But even before that I want to point out, as I have in 10 some past cases, that this Commission has a proud 11 history of running our hearings and meetings in an 12 APPEARANCES orderly manner. And I know the era in which we live, a Commissioners Randy Christmann, Sheri Haugen-Hoffart, and 13 lot of meetings are marked by hissing and booing or Substitute Decisionmaker Timothy J. Dawson 14 clapping and yelling and waving signs and stuff. We've LAWRENCE BENDER and BRET DUBLINSKE, Fredrikson & Byron, P.A., on behalf of Applicant SCS Carbon Transport LIC 15 never done that. And I would ask respectfully for you RANDALL J. BAKKE, Bakke Grinolds Wiederholt, on behalf of Intervenor John H. Warford as Trustee of the John H. Warford, Jr. Revocable Trust and Chad Moldenhauer and Chad Wachter 16 all to help us to maintain that tradition of having a 17 respectful debate and allowing everyone to speak in 18 their turn. Everyone will be allotted equal time by the STEVE J. LEIBEL, Knoll Leibel LLP, on behalf of  ${\tt Intervenors/Landowners}$ 19 judge and run a mature, responsible hearing here. KEVIN PRANIS, on behalf of Intervenor Laborers District Council of Minnesota and North Dakota (LIUNA) 20 The other thing that I wanted to point out that JULIE LAWYER, Burleigh County State's Attorney, on behalf of Burleigh County 21 is a distinction, the previous cases that I see some DERRICK BRAATEN, Braaten Law Firm, on behalf of 22 familiar faces and I know some of you have attended have Emmons County 23 been evidentiary hearings. And while people speak to us ZACHARY PELHAM, Special Assistant Attorney General Advisory Counsel to the Public Service Commission 24 and they're under oath, there's a mix of, like, legal 25 facts as well as opinions in there. You know, you can PAGE 3 give your opinion about the value of this area versus 2 the value of that area. 3 This is different. This is not an evidentiary CONTENTS hearing but a formal hearing to take legal oral 5 arguments on one specific topic. We are here today to Argument by MR. DUBLINSKE
Argument by MR. BRAATEN
Argument by MS. LAWYER
Argument by MR. BAKKE
Argument by MR. LEIBEL
Argument by MR. PRANIS
Rebuttal by MR. DUBLINSKE 6 talk about whether permits issued by this Commission for liquid or gas transmission facilities, whether those 8 permits supersede and preempt local land use or zoning regulations or do they not supersede. That is the 10 question before us. 11 And so opinions, like even our own opinions of 12 whether it should or not, are really beside the point. 13 It's what does the law say. And so that's what we're 14 going to have, oral arguments. All sides will get a 15 fair chance to speak and deliver their legal arguments 16 and we will take them under advisement and make a 17 decision. 18 With that, I have no other comments. 19 Commissioner Haugen-Hoffart, do you? 20 COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: No, I do not. 21 22 COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: And Judge Dawson. 23 SUBSTITUTE DECISIONMAKER DAWSON: No comment. 24 COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Thank you.

25

Our administrative law judge, Hope Hogan, will

# December 21, 2023, Formal Hearing ND PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

	ND PUBLIC SERV		
1	be running the hearing.	1	Commission. To my left is Public Utilities Director
2	I thank you for being here, Judge Hogan, and	2	Victor Schock. Thank you.
3	I'll turn it over to you.	3	ALJ HOGAN: Mr. Bakke.
4	ALJ HOGAN: Thank you, Commissioner.	4	MR. BAKKE: Good afternoon. Randall Bakke on
5	For our record, let it reflect that it's	5	behalf of what we're referring to as the Bismarck
6	December 21st, 2023, at 2 p.m. This is the time and	6	intervenors, which is Chad Wachter, John Warford, and
7	date and place set by the notice of hearing on a motion	7	Chad Moldenhauer.
8	issued by the North Dakota Public Service Commission in	8	ALJ HOGAN: Thank you.
9	Case No. PU-22-391. This hearing is being held today at	9	Mr. Leibel.
10	the Pioneer Room at the State Capitol in Bismarck, North	10	MR. LEIBEL: Steve Leibel of the Bismarck law
11	Dakota.	11	firm of Knoll Leibel, and I'm here on behalf of the
12	As Commissioner Christmann indicated, my name is	12	landowner intervenors, which, as the Commission knows,
13	Hope Hogan and I am the administrative law judge that's	13	they're throughout the state.
14	been designated at the request of the Public Service	14	ALJ HOGAN: Ms. Lawyer.
15	Commission to serve as a procedural hearing officer in	15	MS. LAWYER: Julie Lawyer on behalf of Burleigh
16	this matter, which means I'm not a decisionmaker, but	16	County.
17	I'm merely directing these proceedings in an orderly	17	ALJ HOGAN: And Mr. Braaten.
18	manner.	18	MR. BRAATEN: Derrick Braaten with Braaten Law
19	I'd ask everybody at this time to check their	19	Firm on behalf of Emmons County. And I have sitting
20	cell phones to make sure your cell phone is either	20	next to me Erin Magrum, chair of the Emmons County
21	silenced or turned off so that we don't have cell phone	21	Commission.
22	interruptions during our hearing today.	22	ALJ HOGAN: All right. Thank you.
23	SCS Carbon Transport LLC has filed a renewed	23	A procedure for this hearing was set and
24	motion to declare Burleigh and Emmons County ordinances	24	provided to the parties prior to today's hearing. And
25	superseded and preempted in this proceeding. On October	25	just to summarize, each party will be given 20 minutes
-	PAGE 5	<u>.</u>	PAGE 7
1	5th, 2023, the group of intervenors represented by the	1	to present oral argument with SCS Carbon Transport going
_	Marall Lathal LLC lave Core Clast a various of Carl based as		Cost College of the Forest Country Building Country the
2	Knoll Leibel LLC law firm filed a request for hearing.	2	first, followed by Emmons County, Burleigh County, the
3	And on November 28th, 2023, the Public Service	3	Bismarck intervenors, landowner intervenors, and
3 4	And on November 28th, 2023, the Public Service Commission issued a notice of hearing on the motion	3 4	Bismarck intervenors, landowner intervenors, and Laborers Union.
3 4 5	And on November 28th, 2023, the Public Service Commission issued a notice of hearing on the motion setting the hearing for today's date to hear oral	3 4 5	Bismarck intervenors, landowner intervenors, and Laborers Union.  And I apologize, Mr. Pranis, I didn't mean to
3 4 5 6	And on November 28th, 2023, the Public Service Commission issued a notice of hearing on the motion setting the hearing for today's date to hear oral arguments on the motion.	3 4 5 6	Bismarck intervenors, landowner intervenors, and Laborers Union.  And I apologize, Mr. Pranis, I didn't mean to diminish your appearance. You weren't on my list for
3 4 5 6 7	And on November 28th, 2023, the Public Service Commission issued a notice of hearing on the motion setting the hearing for today's date to hear oral arguments on the motion.  I'm now going to ask the parties to state their	3 4 5 6 7	Bismarck intervenors, landowner intervenors, and Laborers Union.  And I apologize, Mr. Pranis, I didn't mean to diminish your appearance. You weren't on my list for some reason. So you will go last, but can you please
3 4 5 6 7 8	And on November 28th, 2023, the Public Service Commission issued a notice of hearing on the motion setting the hearing for today's date to hear oral arguments on the motion.  I'm now going to ask the parties to state their appearance for the record.	3 4 5 6 7 8	Bismarck intervenors, landowner intervenors, and Laborers Union.  And I apologize, Mr. Pranis, I didn't mean to diminish your appearance. You weren't on my list for some reason. So you will go last, but can you please state your appearance for the record?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	And on November 28th, 2023, the Public Service  Commission issued a notice of hearing on the motion setting the hearing for today's date to hear oral arguments on the motion.  I'm now going to ask the parties to state their appearance for the record.  Mr. Bender or Mr. Dublinske, can you please	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Bismarck intervenors, landowner intervenors, and Laborers Union.  And I apologize, Mr. Pranis, I didn't mean to diminish your appearance. You weren't on my list for some reason. So you will go last, but can you please state your appearance for the record?  MR. PRANIS: Thank you, Your Honor,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	And on November 28th, 2023, the Public Service Commission issued a notice of hearing on the motion setting the hearing for today's date to hear oral arguments on the motion.  I'm now going to ask the parties to state their appearance for the record.  Mr. Bender or Mr. Dublinske, can you please state your appearance for the record today and indicate	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Bismarck intervenors, landowner intervenors, and Laborers Union.  And I apologize, Mr. Pranis, I didn't mean to diminish your appearance. You weren't on my list for some reason. So you will go last, but can you please state your appearance for the record?  MR. PRANIS: Thank you, Your Honor, Commissioners. Kevin Pranis on behalf of LIUNA
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	And on November 28th, 2023, the Public Service Commission issued a notice of hearing on the motion setting the hearing for today's date to hear oral arguments on the motion.  I'm now going to ask the parties to state their appearance for the record.  Mr. Bender or Mr. Dublinske, can you please state your appearance for the record today and indicate who you represent in this matter?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Bismarck intervenors, landowner intervenors, and Laborers Union.  And I apologize, Mr. Pranis, I didn't mean to diminish your appearance. You weren't on my list for some reason. So you will go last, but can you please state your appearance for the record?  MR. PRANIS: Thank you, Your Honor, Commissioners. Kevin Pranis on behalf of LIUNA Minnesota, North Dakota, otherwise known as Laborers
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	And on November 28th, 2023, the Public Service Commission issued a notice of hearing on the motion setting the hearing for today's date to hear oral arguments on the motion.  I'm now going to ask the parties to state their appearance for the record.  Mr. Bender or Mr. Dublinske, can you please state your appearance for the record today and indicate who you represent in this matter?  MR. BENDER: Thank you, Your Honor and	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Bismarck intervenors, landowner intervenors, and Laborers Union.  And I apologize, Mr. Pranis, I didn't mean to diminish your appearance. You weren't on my list for some reason. So you will go last, but can you please state your appearance for the record?  MR. PRANIS: Thank you, Your Honor, Commissioners. Kevin Pranis on behalf of LIUNA Minnesota, North Dakota, otherwise known as Laborers District Council.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	And on November 28th, 2023, the Public Service Commission issued a notice of hearing on the motion setting the hearing for today's date to hear oral arguments on the motion.  I'm now going to ask the parties to state their appearance for the record.  Mr. Bender or Mr. Dublinske, can you please state your appearance for the record today and indicate who you represent in this matter?  MR. BENDER: Thank you, Your Honor and commissioners. Lawrence Bender, PO Box 1855, Bismarck,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Bismarck intervenors, landowner intervenors, and Laborers Union.  And I apologize, Mr. Pranis, I didn't mean to diminish your appearance. You weren't on my list for some reason. So you will go last, but can you please state your appearance for the record?  MR. PRANIS: Thank you, Your Honor, Commissioners. Kevin Pranis on behalf of LIUNA Minnesota, North Dakota, otherwise known as Laborers District Council.  ALJ HOGAN: Thank you.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	And on November 28th, 2023, the Public Service Commission issued a notice of hearing on the motion setting the hearing for today's date to hear oral arguments on the motion.  I'm now going to ask the parties to state their appearance for the record.  Mr. Bender or Mr. Dublinske, can you please state your appearance for the record today and indicate who you represent in this matter?  MR. BENDER: Thank you, Your Honor and commissioners. Lawrence Bender, PO Box 1855, Bismarck, appearing on behalf of the Applicant.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Bismarck intervenors, landowner intervenors, and Laborers Union.  And I apologize, Mr. Pranis, I didn't mean to diminish your appearance. You weren't on my list for some reason. So you will go last, but can you please state your appearance for the record?  MR. PRANIS: Thank you, Your Honor, Commissioners. Kevin Pranis on behalf of LIUNA Minnesota, North Dakota, otherwise known as Laborers District Council.  ALJ HOGAN: Thank you. Following the 20-minute arguments by each party,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	And on November 28th, 2023, the Public Service Commission issued a notice of hearing on the motion setting the hearing for today's date to hear oral arguments on the motion.  I'm now going to ask the parties to state their appearance for the record.  Mr. Bender or Mr. Dublinske, can you please state your appearance for the record today and indicate who you represent in this matter?  MR. BENDER: Thank you, Your Honor and commissioners. Lawrence Bender, PO Box 1855, Bismarck,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Bismarck intervenors, landowner intervenors, and Laborers Union.  And I apologize, Mr. Pranis, I didn't mean to diminish your appearance. You weren't on my list for some reason. So you will go last, but can you please state your appearance for the record?  MR. PRANIS: Thank you, Your Honor, Commissioners. Kevin Pranis on behalf of LIUNA Minnesota, North Dakota, otherwise known as Laborers District Council.  ALJ HOGAN: Thank you.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	And on November 28th, 2023, the Public Service Commission issued a notice of hearing on the motion setting the hearing for today's date to hear oral arguments on the motion.  I'm now going to ask the parties to state their appearance for the record.  Mr. Bender or Mr. Dublinske, can you please state your appearance for the record today and indicate who you represent in this matter?  MR. BENDER: Thank you, Your Honor and commissioners. Lawrence Bender, PO Box 1855, Bismarck, appearing on behalf of the Applicant.  MR. DUBLINSKE: Thank you, Your Honor. Bret Dublinske, also with Fredrikson & Byron, on behalf of	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Bismarck intervenors, landowner intervenors, and Laborers Union.  And I apologize, Mr. Pranis, I didn't mean to diminish your appearance. You weren't on my list for some reason. So you will go last, but can you please state your appearance for the record?  MR. PRANIS: Thank you, Your Honor, Commissioners. Kevin Pranis on behalf of LIUNA Minnesota, North Dakota, otherwise known as Laborers District Council.  ALJ HOGAN: Thank you. Following the 20-minute arguments by each party, I will allow Summit to provide a 10-minute reply argument if they wish to do that. I will be keeping
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	And on November 28th, 2023, the Public Service Commission issued a notice of hearing on the motion setting the hearing for today's date to hear oral arguments on the motion.  I'm now going to ask the parties to state their appearance for the record.  Mr. Bender or Mr. Dublinske, can you please state your appearance for the record today and indicate who you represent in this matter?  MR. BENDER: Thank you, Your Honor and commissioners. Lawrence Bender, PO Box 1855, Bismarck, appearing on behalf of the Applicant.  MR. DUBLINSKE: Thank you, Your Honor. Bret	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Bismarck intervenors, landowner intervenors, and Laborers Union.  And I apologize, Mr. Pranis, I didn't mean to diminish your appearance. You weren't on my list for some reason. So you will go last, but can you please state your appearance for the record?  MR. PRANIS: Thank you, Your Honor, Commissioners. Kevin Pranis on behalf of LIUNA Minnesota, North Dakota, otherwise known as Laborers District Council.  ALJ HOGAN: Thank you. Following the 20-minute arguments by each party, I will allow Summit to provide a 10-minute reply
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	And on November 28th, 2023, the Public Service Commission issued a notice of hearing on the motion setting the hearing for today's date to hear oral arguments on the motion.  I'm now going to ask the parties to state their appearance for the record.  Mr. Bender or Mr. Dublinske, can you please state your appearance for the record today and indicate who you represent in this matter?  MR. BENDER: Thank you, Your Honor and commissioners. Lawrence Bender, PO Box 1855, Bismarck, appearing on behalf of the Applicant.  MR. DUBLINSKE: Thank you, Your Honor. Bret Dublinske, also with Fredrikson & Byron, on behalf of the Applicant.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Bismarck intervenors, landowner intervenors, and Laborers Union.  And I apologize, Mr. Pranis, I didn't mean to diminish your appearance. You weren't on my list for some reason. So you will go last, but can you please state your appearance for the record?  MR. PRANIS: Thank you, Your Honor, Commissioners. Kevin Pranis on behalf of LIUNA Minnesota, North Dakota, otherwise known as Laborers District Council.  ALJ HOGAN: Thank you.  Following the 20-minute arguments by each party, I will allow Summit to provide a 10-minute reply argument if they wish to do that. I will be keeping time during each party's argument and I'll let you know
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	And on November 28th, 2023, the Public Service Commission issued a notice of hearing on the motion setting the hearing for today's date to hear oral arguments on the motion.  I'm now going to ask the parties to state their appearance for the record.  Mr. Bender or Mr. Dublinske, can you please state your appearance for the record today and indicate who you represent in this matter?  MR. BENDER: Thank you, Your Honor and commissioners. Lawrence Bender, PO Box 1855, Bismarck, appearing on behalf of the Applicant.  MR. DUBLINSKE: Thank you, Your Honor. Bret Dublinske, also with Fredrikson & Byron, on behalf of the Applicant.  ALJ HOGAN: And it's my understanding, Mr.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Bismarck intervenors, landowner intervenors, and Laborers Union.  And I apologize, Mr. Pranis, I didn't mean to diminish your appearance. You weren't on my list for some reason. So you will go last, but can you please state your appearance for the record?  MR. PRANIS: Thank you, Your Honor, Commissioners. Kevin Pranis on behalf of LIUNA Minnesota, North Dakota, otherwise known as Laborers District Council.  ALJ HOGAN: Thank you.  Following the 20-minute arguments by each party, I will allow Summit to provide a 10-minute reply argument if they wish to do that. I will be keeping time during each party's argument and I'll let you know when you've reached your allotted time and ask that you
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And on November 28th, 2023, the Public Service Commission issued a notice of hearing on the motion setting the hearing for today's date to hear oral arguments on the motion.  I'm now going to ask the parties to state their appearance for the record.  Mr. Bender or Mr. Dublinske, can you please state your appearance for the record today and indicate who you represent in this matter?  MR. BENDER: Thank you, Your Honor and commissioners. Lawrence Bender, PO Box 1855, Bismarck, appearing on behalf of the Applicant.  MR. DUBLINSKE: Thank you, Your Honor. Bret Dublinske, also with Fredrikson & Byron, on behalf of the Applicant.  ALJ HOGAN: And it's my understanding, Mr. Dublinske, you're going to be arguing today?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Bismarck intervenors, landowner intervenors, and Laborers Union.  And I apologize, Mr. Pranis, I didn't mean to diminish your appearance. You weren't on my list for some reason. So you will go last, but can you please state your appearance for the record?  MR. PRANIS: Thank you, Your Honor, Commissioners. Kevin Pranis on behalf of LIUNA Minnesota, North Dakota, otherwise known as Laborers District Council.  ALJ HOGAN: Thank you.  Following the 20-minute arguments by each party, I will allow Summit to provide a 10-minute reply argument if they wish to do that. I will be keeping time during each party's argument and I'll let you know when you've reached your allotted time and ask that you please wrap up your presentations. I will allow the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	And on November 28th, 2023, the Public Service Commission issued a notice of hearing on the motion setting the hearing for today's date to hear oral arguments on the motion.  I'm now going to ask the parties to state their appearance for the record.  Mr. Bender or Mr. Dublinske, can you please state your appearance for the record today and indicate who you represent in this matter?  MR. BENDER: Thank you, Your Honor and commissioners. Lawrence Bender, PO Box 1855, Bismarck, appearing on behalf of the Applicant.  MR. DUBLINSKE: Thank you, Your Honor. Bret Dublinske, also with Fredrikson & Byron, on behalf of the Applicant.  ALJ HOGAN: And it's my understanding, Mr. Dublinske, you're going to be arguing today?  MR. DUBLINSKE: That is correct, Your Honor.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Bismarck intervenors, landowner intervenors, and Laborers Union.  And I apologize, Mr. Pranis, I didn't mean to diminish your appearance. You weren't on my list for some reason. So you will go last, but can you please state your appearance for the record?  MR. PRANIS: Thank you, Your Honor, Commissioners. Kevin Pranis on behalf of LIUNA Minnesota, North Dakota, otherwise known as Laborers District Council.  ALJ HOGAN: Thank you.  Following the 20-minute arguments by each party, I will allow Summit to provide a 10-minute reply argument if they wish to do that. I will be keeping time during each party's argument and I'll let you know when you've reached your allotted time and ask that you please wrap up your presentations. I will allow the commissioners to ask questions after each party's
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	And on November 28th, 2023, the Public Service Commission issued a notice of hearing on the motion setting the hearing for today's date to hear oral arguments on the motion.  I'm now going to ask the parties to state their appearance for the record.  Mr. Bender or Mr. Dublinske, can you please state your appearance for the record today and indicate who you represent in this matter?  MR. BENDER: Thank you, Your Honor and commissioners. Lawrence Bender, PO Box 1855, Bismarck, appearing on behalf of the Applicant.  MR. DUBLINSKE: Thank you, Your Honor. Bret Dublinske, also with Fredrikson & Byron, on behalf of the Applicant.  ALJ HOGAN: And it's my understanding, Mr. Dublinske, you're going to be arguing today?  MR. DUBLINSKE: That is correct, Your Honor. ALJ HOGAN: All right. Thank you.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Bismarck intervenors, landowner intervenors, and Laborers Union.  And I apologize, Mr. Pranis, I didn't mean to diminish your appearance. You weren't on my list for some reason. So you will go last, but can you please state your appearance for the record?  MR. PRANIS: Thank you, Your Honor, Commissioners. Kevin Pranis on behalf of LIUNA Minnesota, North Dakota, otherwise known as Laborers District Council.  ALJ HOGAN: Thank you.  Following the 20-minute arguments by each party, I will allow Summit to provide a 10-minute reply argument if they wish to do that. I will be keeping time during each party's argument and I'll let you know when you've reached your allotted time and ask that you please wrap up your presentations. I will allow the commissioners to ask questions after each party's presentation and I will not count those questions or
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	And on November 28th, 2023, the Public Service Commission issued a notice of hearing on the motion setting the hearing for today's date to hear oral arguments on the motion.  I'm now going to ask the parties to state their appearance for the record.  Mr. Bender or Mr. Dublinske, can you please state your appearance for the record today and indicate who you represent in this matter?  MR. BENDER: Thank you, Your Honor and commissioners. Lawrence Bender, PO Box 1855, Bismarck, appearing on behalf of the Applicant.  MR. DUBLINSKE: Thank you, Your Honor. Bret Dublinske, also with Fredrikson & Byron, on behalf of the Applicant.  ALJ HOGAN: And it's my understanding, Mr. Dublinske, you're going to be arguing today?  MR. DUBLINSKE: That is correct, Your Honor. ALJ HOGAN: All right. Thank you.  Mr. Pelham, would you like to state your	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Bismarck intervenors, landowner intervenors, and Laborers Union.  And I apologize, Mr. Pranis, I didn't mean to diminish your appearance. You weren't on my list for some reason. So you will go last, but can you please state your appearance for the record?  MR. PRANIS: Thank you, Your Honor, Commissioners. Kevin Pranis on behalf of LIUNA Minnesota, North Dakota, otherwise known as Laborers District Council.  ALJ HOGAN: Thank you.  Following the 20-minute arguments by each party, I will allow Summit to provide a 10-minute reply argument if they wish to do that. I will be keeping time during each party's argument and I'll let you know when you've reached your allotted time and ask that you please wrap up your presentations. I will allow the commissioners to ask questions after each party's presentation and I will not count those questions or replies against your allotted time.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And on November 28th, 2023, the Public Service Commission issued a notice of hearing on the motion setting the hearing for today's date to hear oral arguments on the motion.  I'm now going to ask the parties to state their appearance for the record.  Mr. Bender or Mr. Dublinske, can you please state your appearance for the record today and indicate who you represent in this matter?  MR. BENDER: Thank you, Your Honor and commissioners. Lawrence Bender, PO Box 1855, Bismarck, appearing on behalf of the Applicant.  MR. DUBLINSKE: Thank you, Your Honor. Bret Dublinske, also with Fredrikson & Byron, on behalf of the Applicant.  ALJ HOGAN: And it's my understanding, Mr. Dublinske, you're going to be arguing today?  MR. DUBLINSKE: That is correct, Your Honor.  ALJ HOGAN: All right. Thank you.  Mr. Pelham, would you like to state your appearance for the record?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Bismarck intervenors, landowner intervenors, and Laborers Union.  And I apologize, Mr. Pranis, I didn't mean to diminish your appearance. You weren't on my list for some reason. So you will go last, but can you please state your appearance for the record?  MR. PRANIS: Thank you, Your Honor, Commissioners. Kevin Pranis on behalf of LIUNA Minnesota, North Dakota, otherwise known as Laborers District Council.  ALJ HOGAN: Thank you.  Following the 20-minute arguments by each party, I will allow Summit to provide a 10-minute reply argument if they wish to do that. I will be keeping time during each party's argument and I'll let you know when you've reached your allotted time and ask that you please wrap up your presentations. I will allow the commissioners to ask questions after each party's presentation and I will not count those questions or replies against your allotted time.  Are there any other preliminary matters we need

PAGE 8

## December 21, 2023, Formal Hearing ND PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1 COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Just a message I briefing back and forth on this issue has appropriately 2 received from upstairs was that some of the attorneys 2 been a debate about the statutory interpretation of the 3 were hard to hear in this room. These mics, you have to 3 words of 49-22.1-13(2). Some of that debate has 4 be pretty close to the mic so... 4 involved questions of intent by taking isolated comments 5 ALJ HOGAN: All right. Thank you. 5 from a handful of legislators and committee witnesses, 6 6 So then I'll turn to you, Mr. Dublinske, you can but at the end of the day, the best indicator of 7 7 legislative intent and what binds the Commission is the start us off. 8 MR. DUBLINSKE: Thank you, Your Honor, and good 8 language that was actually passed by majority vote and 9 afternoon. May it please the Commission, colleagues. 9 signed into law. 10 10 As I mentioned, I'm Bret Dublinske of Fredrikson & Byron Looked at carefully, 49-22.1-13(2) is actually 11 11 for SCS Carbon Transport who I'll refer to as "Summit" pretty clear. Indeed it reads very much like a 12 this afternoon for short. Good to see you all again. 12 flowchart for a decision. Summit would suggest that the 13 13 first three paragraphs, (a), (b), and (c), provide North Dakota as a matter of state policy is a 14 leader in the promotion of carbon capture and 14 substantive categories in how those are treated. And if 15 sequestration. The State has invested significant 15 you look carefully at the language, they all have 16 resources in being the first state to establish primacy 16 important distinctions. 17 over Class VI carbon dioxide injection and storage 17 So section 2, paragraph -- or subsection 2, 18 systems, but that policy is for naught if transmission 18 paragraph (a) pertains specifically to conversion 19 systems cannot be built to get the CO2 to where it will 19 facilities, and it says that the commission's 20 20 be sequestered. certificate may not preempt a wide list of local 21 21 As in many other states, the responsibilities regulations including zoning. Paragraph (b), on the 22 22 for decisions regarding pipeline permitting are granted other hand, pertains only to transmission facilities and 23 23 first and foremost to the expert administrative agency, says that the commission's permit automatically preempts 24 the Public Service Commission. The Commission is in the 24 a narrower list that includes land use and zoning ordinances. Then there's a middle category in (c) where 25 best position to take a statewide view to apply its 25 PAGE 9 PAGE 11 1 unique and specific expertise regarding pipelines and 1 the commission has discretion. It applies to 2 pipeline law and to render a decision. 2 transmission facilities and it says that a commission 3 As the Commission is aware, two counties have, 3 permit may preempt or may require the applicant to 4 in the last year, passed ordinances that they seek to comply with, and I'll quote paragraph (c) here, "the 5 apply to the Summit pipeline project. These counties 5 road use agreements" subject to certain showings in that 6 have adopted standards and procedures that are different 6 paragraph. 7 from the State, different from the Federal Government, 7 After those three categories, paragraphs (d) and 8 and even different from each other, creating a 8 (e) are simply implementation, not new, substantive 9 burdensome patchwork of various and overlapping 9 categories. (D), again regarding transmission 10 10 standards. This is not an efficient or an effective way facilities, requires that localities have to file local 11 11 to promote state policy. requirements -- doesn't use the term "ordinance" -- ten 12 12 Summit, however, believes that the plain days in advance or they are preempted. And then 13 language of the North Dakota Century Code provides a 13 paragraph (e) says that the applicant must abide by the 14 clear solution. Summit brought this renewed motion 14 local requirements that are not otherwise superseded by 15 regarding preemption because we believe that addressing, 15 the steps above. That is, they aren't automatically 16 and hopefully resolving, this issue upfront will make 16 superseded by paragraph (b) or they aren't 17 the remainder of the proceeding more efficient as it 17 discretionarily superseded by a decision in 18 will either remove an evidentiary issue that would 18 19 otherwise require additional materials in the record or 19 This, as near as I can tell, is the only way to 20 it will guide what needs to be presented. But either 20 read the statute that gives effect to all of the 21 21 way, a ruling now helps avoid wasted efforts. separate paragraphs. 22 22 That said, as I will explain momentarily, while Arguments from some of the parties appear to 23 23 start at the bottom of the list and work backwards and Summit does seek a ruling confirming its understanding 24 24 of this issue, Summit actually believes that the statute say that paragraph (e) says that a transmission facility

25

must abide by local requirements, but that would read

PAGE 12

25

makes preemption automatic. Overwhelmingly, the

### December 21, 2023, Formal Hearing ND PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

paragraph (b), the transmission permits preempt, out of Commission disagrees, that helps steer the hearing and 2 the statute entirely, which is an impermissible 2 the evidentiary issue can be wrapped into the rest of 3 interpretation. Similarly, arguments that all 3 the case and the evidence presented on reconsideration. 4 preemption requires an affirmative decision of the 4 Second, that said, even applying the factors, Summit 5 Commission based on the factors in paragraph (c) not 5 believes the board can rule now on that basis. 6 6 only reads paragraph (b) out but also ignores the The unreasonableness is clear on the face of the 7 express limitation in paragraph (c) to road use 7 ordinances as is the conflict with federal law. In 8 agreements. 8 Emmons County, for example, they adopted a nearly 9 Summit's approach that paragraphs (a), (b), and 9 8,000-foot setback from occupied structures compared to 10 (c) set forth three substantive categories and their 10 500 feet as a state standard, 16 times larger. Summit 11 11 status, not preempted, always preempted, sometimes believes that the Commission can find that unreasonably 12 preempted, and that (d) and (e) are about implementation 12 restrictive on its face. 13 makes logical sense of the whole of section --13 Burleigh County is even more extreme; two miles 14 subsection 2 read together. 14 from an occupied structure, approximately 20 times the 15 15 And that structure makes logical sense as well state standard. And Burleigh also has a setback, 16 because conversion facilities, a gas plant, for example, 16 interestingly enough, of 10 miles from any electric 17 is at a single site that is usually in one county where 17 transmission line. Setbacks of that length are, on 18 it has impacts, but linear infrastructure like a 18 their face, an unreasonable restriction and obviously 19 19 pipeline is often in multiple counties and it needs to block out huge amounts of the county. 20 20 be viewed as a whole across the entire route. They are And there are other setbacks beyond just those 21 21 different projects of a different nature, and it makes one or two that are equally excessive and they all 22 22 sense that the Legislature would treat them differently combine to have a cumulative impact. The maps in our 23 23 as the language of paragraphs (a) and (b) do. briefs merely demonstrate that fact. And the fact that 24 Because the words on the page are clear and 24 those ordinances were adopted well after Summit's 25 there is no ambiguity, diving into the legislative 25 project was underway, changing the rules well into PAGE 13 1 history is not needed or appropriate. And in any event, 1 design and engineering, only adds to the unreasonable 2 you can find isolated snippets on either side. But the 2 burden. 3 one thing that I would say about legislative history 3 Paragraph 49-22.1-13(2)(c) also makes clear that 4 that I think is clear is that the legislators were told conflict with other laws is a basis for preemption. 5 most bluntly by then Representative Keiser that the 5 Burleigh County's ordinance, for example, repeatedly and 6 amendments could be interpreted just as Summit suggests 6 several times in the Purposes section alone states its 7 and the Legislature passed that language knowing it. 7 purpose as being safety. It talks about blast zones or 8 Read into that what you will. 8 fatality zones which, again, makes clear its purpose is 9 9 In the alternative, however, even the parties to engage in safety regulation which, by express 10 10 that disagree with the automatic preemption language in federal law and also controlling Eighth 11 11 Circuit precedent, is preempted. The Burleigh ordinance interpretation all appear to argue that, at worst for 12 12 establishes its own definition of "high consequence Summit, the Commission may preempt by applying the area," a term of art in federal PHMSA regulations that 13 factors in paragraph (c). And we disagree with that. 13 14 Let me run through that analysis as well. The 14 has a different definition there. At Section 7.2 it standards in paragraph (c) include whether the 15 15 even purports to regulate the spacing on shut-off valves 16 regulations are, quote, "unreasonably restrictive" and 16 and fracture arresters which are subjects of specific 17 whether they, quote, "conflict with state or federal 17 and explicit PHMSA regulations. 18 18 law." Much of the resistance here is boiled down to a

But the setbacks, especially ones the unusual length of those in Emmons and Burleigh ordinances, also serve no purpose other than to regulate safety and/or to block the project. In the supplemental authority case that Summit filed from a federal court in Iowa, that judge, implementing a series of Eighth Circuit precedence, found that setbacks much smaller than those at issue here were a proxy for safety regulations and PAGE 16

regard to transmission facilities and zoning ordinances, 25 but the point of filing the motion now is that if the

Summit's primary position remains that the plain

claim that Summit hadn't entered enough evidence on

Summit has two responses to that. First,

legislative language makes the preemption automatic with

19

20

21

22

23

24

those factors.

PAGE 14

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

	ND PUBLIC SERV	IOL	
1	found them preempted by federal law.	1	MR. BRAATEN: Thank you, Judge Hogan.
2	Moreover, to the extent those setbacks serve, or	2	I'd like to start by talking a little bit about
3	as the quotes from local officials that we included in	3	the Emmons County ordinance specifically, and I also
4	our reply brief show, are intended to prevent the	4	intend to spend some time discussing this issue of
5	project, that also conflicts with state law and state	5	statutory interpretation and spending a little time with
6	policy which is designed to balance the interests the	6	the statute itself.
7	State has in infrastructure investments with other	7	But I want to first talk about the Emmons County
8	concerns. That is, the state law is intended to allow,	8	ordinance, because when we're talking about supersession
9	subject to reasonable regulations, not to prohibit,	9	and preemption, and specifically if we're going to talk
10	pipelines, including carbon dioxide pipelines. To the	10	about conflict of laws, that is something that can only
11	extent that local ordinance have the intent or the	11	be analyzed with respect to the actual language of the
12	effect of prohibiting carbon dioxide pipelines in that	12	actual local ordinance at issue. And a lot of the
13	county, that also is conflict with state law.	13	arguments that have been made by Summit tend to attempt
14	Your Honor, Summit has a good route in North	14	to sweep up the Emmons County ordinance along with
15	Dakota that has now reached 80 percent voluntary	15	numerous comments about other ordinances.
16	easements and climbing. Summit has heard and responded	16	And so I want to take a little time to point out
17	to concerns about the proximity to Bismarck. And this	17	the unique nature of the Emmons County ordinance as well
18	Commission should not allow a handful of opponents in	18	as the fact that it's an ordinance that's been on the
19	local governments to undermine the state policy or to	19	books in Emmons County since the 1980s. And this is
20	serve as a veto on a project that landowners on the	20	particularly important because, as the Commission saw,
21	route, agricultural interests and others, support and	21	Summit filed a federal court decision out of Iowa and
22	which will provide investment and jobs for the state.	22	that decision relates to conflict of laws.
23	Century Code 49-22.1-13(2) provides a clear path	23	And I want to talk a little bit about the PHMSA
24	for the expert Public Service Commission to manage	24	guidance letter that was sent out that contradicts some
25	siting of transmission projects like pipelines and to	25	of what was in that opinion, but, more importantly, that
	PAGE 17		PAGE 19
1	avoid the kind of jigsaw puzzle approach of different	1	opinion is really specific to and the analysis is based
	avoid the kind of jigsaw puzzle approach of different	_	opinion is really specific to and the analysis is based
2	rules and processes for different parts of the single	2	upon what happened in that particular county in Iowa.
			upon what happened in that particular county in Iowa.  And that is a different analysis than what happened in
2	rules and processes for different parts of the single pipeline.  Again, the recent federal decision from Iowa,	2	upon what happened in that particular county in Iowa.  And that is a different analysis than what happened in  Emmons County, North Dakota.
2 3 4 5	rules and processes for different parts of the single pipeline.  Again, the recent federal decision from Iowa, the court discusses the policy reasons for statewide	2 3 4 5	upon what happened in that particular county in Iowa.  And that is a different analysis than what happened in  Emmons County, North Dakota.  So the Emmons County ordinance regulates land
2 3 4 5 6	rules and processes for different parts of the single pipeline.  Again, the recent federal decision from Iowa, the court discusses the policy reasons for statewide rather than county-by-county siting. And while it's not	2 3 4 5 6	upon what happened in that particular county in Iowa.  And that is a different analysis than what happened in Emmons County, North Dakota.  So the Emmons County ordinance regulates land uses in the county and it was amended after the siting
2 3 4 5 6 7	rules and processes for different parts of the single pipeline.  Again, the recent federal decision from Iowa, the court discusses the policy reasons for statewide rather than county-by-county siting. And while it's not directly applying North Dakota law, it does support the	2 3 4 5	upon what happened in that particular county in Iowa.  And that is a different analysis than what happened in Emmons County, North Dakota.  So the Emmons County ordinance regulates land uses in the county and it was amended after the siting application, but one of the things that I handed out to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	rules and processes for different parts of the single pipeline.  Again, the recent federal decision from Iowa, the court discusses the policy reasons for statewide rather than county-by-county siting. And while it's not directly applying North Dakota law, it does support the sort of distinction that the language in the legislation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	upon what happened in that particular county in Iowa.  And that is a different analysis than what happened in Emmons County, North Dakota.  So the Emmons County ordinance regulates land uses in the county and it was amended after the siting application, but one of the things that I handed out to folks is just a couple pages out of the prior Emmons
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	rules and processes for different parts of the single pipeline.  Again, the recent federal decision from Iowa, the court discusses the policy reasons for statewide rather than county-by-county siting. And while it's not directly applying North Dakota law, it does support the sort of distinction that the language in the legislation used, language that clearly provides that a permit for a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	upon what happened in that particular county in Iowa.  And that is a different analysis than what happened in Emmons County, North Dakota.  So the Emmons County ordinance regulates land uses in the county and it was amended after the siting application, but one of the things that I handed out to folks is just a couple pages out of the prior Emmons County ordinance. And this is Article VI, subdivision
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	rules and processes for different parts of the single pipeline.  Again, the recent federal decision from Iowa, the court discusses the policy reasons for statewide rather than county-by-county siting. And while it's not directly applying North Dakota law, it does support the sort of distinction that the language in the legislation used, language that clearly provides that a permit for a liquid transmission facility preempts local land use	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	upon what happened in that particular county in Iowa.  And that is a different analysis than what happened in Emmons County, North Dakota.  So the Emmons County ordinance regulates land uses in the county and it was amended after the siting application, but one of the things that I handed out to folks is just a couple pages out of the prior Emmons County ordinance. And this is Article VI, subdivision B, and you can look down to (2)(a) and (2)(b) and that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	rules and processes for different parts of the single pipeline.  Again, the recent federal decision from Iowa, the court discusses the policy reasons for statewide rather than county-by-county siting. And while it's not directly applying North Dakota law, it does support the sort of distinction that the language in the legislation used, language that clearly provides that a permit for a liquid transmission facility preempts local land use regulations.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	upon what happened in that particular county in Iowa.  And that is a different analysis than what happened in Emmons County, North Dakota.  So the Emmons County ordinance regulates land uses in the county and it was amended after the siting application, but one of the things that I handed out to folks is just a couple pages out of the prior Emmons County ordinance. And this is Article VI, subdivision B, and you can look down to (2)(a) and (2)(b) and that governs. And the amendment that was made in the Emmons
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	rules and processes for different parts of the single pipeline.  Again, the recent federal decision from Iowa, the court discusses the policy reasons for statewide rather than county-by-county siting. And while it's not directly applying North Dakota law, it does support the sort of distinction that the language in the legislation used, language that clearly provides that a permit for a liquid transmission facility preempts local land use regulations.  Summit respectfully asks the Commission to find	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	upon what happened in that particular county in Iowa.  And that is a different analysis than what happened in Emmons County, North Dakota.  So the Emmons County ordinance regulates land uses in the county and it was amended after the siting application, but one of the things that I handed out to folks is just a couple pages out of the prior Emmons County ordinance. And this is Article VI, subdivision B, and you can look down to (2)(a) and (2)(b) and that governs. And the amendment that was made in the Emmons County ordinance was made to specifically an existing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	rules and processes for different parts of the single pipeline.  Again, the recent federal decision from Iowa, the court discusses the policy reasons for statewide rather than county-by-county siting. And while it's not directly applying North Dakota law, it does support the sort of distinction that the language in the legislation used, language that clearly provides that a permit for a liquid transmission facility preempts local land use regulations.  Summit respectfully asks the Commission to find the Burleigh and Emmons County ordinances preempted or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	upon what happened in that particular county in Iowa.  And that is a different analysis than what happened in Emmons County, North Dakota.  So the Emmons County ordinance regulates land uses in the county and it was amended after the siting application, but one of the things that I handed out to folks is just a couple pages out of the prior Emmons County ordinance. And this is Article VI, subdivision B, and you can look down to (2)(a) and (2)(b) and that governs. And the amendment that was made in the Emmons County ordinance was made to specifically an existing provision at B(2)(b)(i). And there were setbacks.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	rules and processes for different parts of the single pipeline.  Again, the recent federal decision from Iowa, the court discusses the policy reasons for statewide rather than county-by-county siting. And while it's not directly applying North Dakota law, it does support the sort of distinction that the language in the legislation used, language that clearly provides that a permit for a liquid transmission facility preempts local land use regulations.  Summit respectfully asks the Commission to find the Burleigh and Emmons County ordinances preempted or that they will be preempted by a permit if this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	upon what happened in that particular county in Iowa.  And that is a different analysis than what happened in Emmons County, North Dakota.  So the Emmons County ordinance regulates land uses in the county and it was amended after the siting application, but one of the things that I handed out to folks is just a couple pages out of the prior Emmons County ordinance. And this is Article VI, subdivision B, and you can look down to (2)(a) and (2)(b) and that governs. And the amendment that was made in the Emmons County ordinance was made to specifically an existing provision at B(2)(b)(i). And there were setbacks.  And what I want to point out specifically and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	rules and processes for different parts of the single pipeline.  Again, the recent federal decision from Iowa, the court discusses the policy reasons for statewide rather than county-by-county siting. And while it's not directly applying North Dakota law, it does support the sort of distinction that the language in the legislation used, language that clearly provides that a permit for a liquid transmission facility preempts local land use regulations.  Summit respectfully asks the Commission to find the Burleigh and Emmons County ordinances preempted or that they will be preempted by a permit if this Commission grants one as the to the extent that they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	upon what happened in that particular county in Iowa.  And that is a different analysis than what happened in Emmons County, North Dakota.  So the Emmons County ordinance regulates land uses in the county and it was amended after the siting application, but one of the things that I handed out to folks is just a couple pages out of the prior Emmons County ordinance. And this is Article VI, subdivision B, and you can look down to (2)(a) and (2)(b) and that governs. And the amendment that was made in the Emmons County ordinance was made to specifically an existing provision at B(2)(b)(i). And there were setbacks.  And what I want to point out specifically and importantly is that at the top of this page, prior to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	rules and processes for different parts of the single pipeline.  Again, the recent federal decision from Iowa, the court discusses the policy reasons for statewide rather than county-by-county siting. And while it's not directly applying North Dakota law, it does support the sort of distinction that the language in the legislation used, language that clearly provides that a permit for a liquid transmission facility preempts local land use regulations.  Summit respectfully asks the Commission to find the Burleigh and Emmons County ordinances preempted or that they will be preempted by a permit if this Commission grants one as the to the extent that they purport to apply to this project and to treat this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	upon what happened in that particular county in Iowa.  And that is a different analysis than what happened in Emmons County, North Dakota.  So the Emmons County ordinance regulates land uses in the county and it was amended after the siting application, but one of the things that I handed out to folks is just a couple pages out of the prior Emmons County ordinance. And this is Article VI, subdivision B, and you can look down to (2)(a) and (2)(b) and that governs. And the amendment that was made in the Emmons County ordinance was made to specifically an existing provision at B(2)(b)(i). And there were setbacks.  And what I want to point out specifically and importantly is that at the top of this page, prior to Emmons County amending its ordinance to bring CO2
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	rules and processes for different parts of the single pipeline.  Again, the recent federal decision from Iowa, the court discusses the policy reasons for statewide rather than county-by-county siting. And while it's not directly applying North Dakota law, it does support the sort of distinction that the language in the legislation used, language that clearly provides that a permit for a liquid transmission facility preempts local land use regulations.  Summit respectfully asks the Commission to find the Burleigh and Emmons County ordinances preempted or that they will be preempted by a permit if this Commission grants one as the to the extent that they purport to apply to this project and to treat this multi-county pipeline as a unified, uniform state issue.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	upon what happened in that particular county in Iowa.  And that is a different analysis than what happened in Emmons County, North Dakota.  So the Emmons County ordinance regulates land uses in the county and it was amended after the siting application, but one of the things that I handed out to folks is just a couple pages out of the prior Emmons County ordinance. And this is Article VI, subdivision B, and you can look down to (2)(a) and (2)(b) and that governs. And the amendment that was made in the Emmons County ordinance was made to specifically an existing provision at B(2)(b)(i). And there were setbacks.  And what I want to point out specifically and importantly is that at the top of this page, prior to Emmons County amending its ordinance to bring CO2 companies within its purview, it already regulated
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	rules and processes for different parts of the single pipeline.  Again, the recent federal decision from Iowa, the court discusses the policy reasons for statewide rather than county-by-county siting. And while it's not directly applying North Dakota law, it does support the sort of distinction that the language in the legislation used, language that clearly provides that a permit for a liquid transmission facility preempts local land use regulations.  Summit respectfully asks the Commission to find the Burleigh and Emmons County ordinances preempted or that they will be preempted by a permit if this Commission grants one as the to the extent that they purport to apply to this project and to treat this multi-county pipeline as a unified, uniform state issue.  Thank you. I'd be happy to answer any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	upon what happened in that particular county in Iowa.  And that is a different analysis than what happened in Emmons County, North Dakota.  So the Emmons County ordinance regulates land uses in the county and it was amended after the siting application, but one of the things that I handed out to folks is just a couple pages out of the prior Emmons County ordinance. And this is Article VI, subdivision B, and you can look down to (2)(a) and (2)(b) and that governs. And the amendment that was made in the Emmons County ordinance was made to specifically an existing provision at B(2)(b)(i). And there were setbacks.  And what I want to point out specifically and importantly is that at the top of this page, prior to Emmons County amending its ordinance to bring CO2 companies within its purview, it already regulated pipelines. And it regulated electric transmission
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	rules and processes for different parts of the single pipeline.  Again, the recent federal decision from Iowa, the court discusses the policy reasons for statewide rather than county-by-county siting. And while it's not directly applying North Dakota law, it does support the sort of distinction that the language in the legislation used, language that clearly provides that a permit for a liquid transmission facility preempts local land use regulations.  Summit respectfully asks the Commission to find the Burleigh and Emmons County ordinances preempted or that they will be preempted by a permit if this Commission grants one as the to the extent that they purport to apply to this project and to treat this multi-county pipeline as a unified, uniform state issue.  Thank you. I'd be happy to answer any questions.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	upon what happened in that particular county in Iowa.  And that is a different analysis than what happened in Emmons County, North Dakota.  So the Emmons County ordinance regulates land uses in the county and it was amended after the siting application, but one of the things that I handed out to folks is just a couple pages out of the prior Emmons County ordinance. And this is Article VI, subdivision B, and you can look down to (2)(a) and (2)(b) and that governs. And the amendment that was made in the Emmons County ordinance was made to specifically an existing provision at B(2)(b)(i). And there were setbacks.  And what I want to point out specifically and importantly is that at the top of this page, prior to Emmons County amending its ordinance to bring CO2 companies within its purview, it already regulated pipelines. And it regulated electric transmission facilities as well as transmission pipelines for water,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	rules and processes for different parts of the single pipeline.  Again, the recent federal decision from Iowa, the court discusses the policy reasons for statewide rather than county-by-county siting. And while it's not directly applying North Dakota law, it does support the sort of distinction that the language in the legislation used, language that clearly provides that a permit for a liquid transmission facility preempts local land use regulations.  Summit respectfully asks the Commission to find the Burleigh and Emmons County ordinances preempted or that they will be preempted by a permit if this  Commission grants one as the to the extent that they purport to apply to this project and to treat this multi-county pipeline as a unified, uniform state issue.  Thank you. I'd be happy to answer any questions.  ALJ HOGAN: All right. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	upon what happened in that particular county in Iowa.  And that is a different analysis than what happened in Emmons County, North Dakota.  So the Emmons County ordinance regulates land uses in the county and it was amended after the siting application, but one of the things that I handed out to folks is just a couple pages out of the prior Emmons County ordinance. And this is Article VI, subdivision B, and you can look down to (2)(a) and (2)(b) and that governs. And the amendment that was made in the Emmons County ordinance was made to specifically an existing provision at B(2)(b)(i). And there were setbacks.  And what I want to point out specifically and importantly is that at the top of this page, prior to Emmons County amending its ordinance to bring CO2 companies within its purview, it already regulated pipelines. And it regulated electric transmission facilities as well as transmission pipelines for water, gas, oil, or coal slurry.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	rules and processes for different parts of the single pipeline.  Again, the recent federal decision from Iowa, the court discusses the policy reasons for statewide rather than county-by-county siting. And while it's not directly applying North Dakota law, it does support the sort of distinction that the language in the legislation used, language that clearly provides that a permit for a liquid transmission facility preempts local land use regulations.  Summit respectfully asks the Commission to find the Burleigh and Emmons County ordinances preempted or that they will be preempted by a permit if this  Commission grants one as the to the extent that they purport to apply to this project and to treat this multi-county pipeline as a unified, uniform state issue.  Thank you. I'd be happy to answer any questions.  ALJ HOGAN: All right. Thank you.  Are there any questions from commissioners or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	upon what happened in that particular county in Iowa.  And that is a different analysis than what happened in Emmons County, North Dakota.  So the Emmons County ordinance regulates land uses in the county and it was amended after the siting application, but one of the things that I handed out to folks is just a couple pages out of the prior Emmons County ordinance. And this is Article VI, subdivision B, and you can look down to (2)(a) and (2)(b) and that governs. And the amendment that was made in the Emmons County ordinance was made to specifically an existing provision at B(2)(b)(i). And there were setbacks.  And what I want to point out specifically and importantly is that at the top of this page, prior to Emmons County amending its ordinance to bring CO2 companies within its purview, it already regulated pipelines. And it regulated electric transmission facilities as well as transmission pipelines for water, gas, oil, or coal slurry.  And so this wasn't a situation where Emmons
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	rules and processes for different parts of the single pipeline.  Again, the recent federal decision from Iowa, the court discusses the policy reasons for statewide rather than county-by-county siting. And while it's not directly applying North Dakota law, it does support the sort of distinction that the language in the legislation used, language that clearly provides that a permit for a liquid transmission facility preempts local land use regulations.  Summit respectfully asks the Commission to find the Burleigh and Emmons County ordinances preempted or that they will be preempted by a permit if this  Commission grants one as the to the extent that they purport to apply to this project and to treat this multi-county pipeline as a unified, uniform state issue.  Thank you. I'd be happy to answer any questions.  ALJ HOGAN: All right. Thank you.  Are there any questions from commissioners or Mr. Dawson?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	upon what happened in that particular county in Iowa.  And that is a different analysis than what happened in Emmons County, North Dakota.  So the Emmons County ordinance regulates land uses in the county and it was amended after the siting application, but one of the things that I handed out to folks is just a couple pages out of the prior Emmons County ordinance. And this is Article VI, subdivision B, and you can look down to (2)(a) and (2)(b) and that governs. And the amendment that was made in the Emmons County ordinance was made to specifically an existing provision at B(2)(b)(i). And there were setbacks.  And what I want to point out specifically and importantly is that at the top of this page, prior to Emmons County amending its ordinance to bring CO2 companies within its purview, it already regulated pipelines. And it regulated electric transmission facilities as well as transmission pipelines for water, gas, oil, or coal slurry.  And so this wasn't a situation where Emmons County developed a new ordinance specifically related to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	rules and processes for different parts of the single pipeline.  Again, the recent federal decision from Iowa, the court discusses the policy reasons for statewide rather than county-by-county siting. And while it's not directly applying North Dakota law, it does support the sort of distinction that the language in the legislation used, language that clearly provides that a permit for a liquid transmission facility preempts local land use regulations.  Summit respectfully asks the Commission to find the Burleigh and Emmons County ordinances preempted or that they will be preempted by a permit if this  Commission grants one as the to the extent that they purport to apply to this project and to treat this multi-county pipeline as a unified, uniform state issue.  Thank you. I'd be happy to answer any questions.  ALJ HOGAN: All right. Thank you.  Are there any questions from commissioners or Mr. Dawson?  All right. No questions.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	upon what happened in that particular county in Iowa.  And that is a different analysis than what happened in Emmons County, North Dakota.  So the Emmons County ordinance regulates land uses in the county and it was amended after the siting application, but one of the things that I handed out to folks is just a couple pages out of the prior Emmons County ordinance. And this is Article VI, subdivision B, and you can look down to (2)(a) and (2)(b) and that governs. And the amendment that was made in the Emmons County ordinance was made to specifically an existing provision at B(2)(b)(i). And there were setbacks.  And what I want to point out specifically and importantly is that at the top of this page, prior to Emmons County amending its ordinance to bring CO2 companies within its purview, it already regulated pipelines. And it regulated electric transmission facilities as well as transmission pipelines for water, gas, oil, or coal slurry.  And so this wasn't a situation where Emmons County developed a new ordinance specifically related to pipelines as a land use in their county. They simply,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	rules and processes for different parts of the single pipeline.  Again, the recent federal decision from Iowa, the court discusses the policy reasons for statewide rather than county-by-county siting. And while it's not directly applying North Dakota law, it does support the sort of distinction that the language in the legislation used, language that clearly provides that a permit for a liquid transmission facility preempts local land use regulations.  Summit respectfully asks the Commission to find the Burleigh and Emmons County ordinances preempted or that they will be preempted by a permit if this  Commission grants one as the to the extent that they purport to apply to this project and to treat this multi-county pipeline as a unified, uniform state issue.  Thank you. I'd be happy to answer any questions.  ALJ HOGAN: All right. Thank you.  Are there any questions from commissioners or Mr. Dawson?  All right. No questions.  All right. Then the next party on my list is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	upon what happened in that particular county in Iowa.  And that is a different analysis than what happened in Emmons County, North Dakota.  So the Emmons County ordinance regulates land uses in the county and it was amended after the siting application, but one of the things that I handed out to folks is just a couple pages out of the prior Emmons County ordinance. And this is Article VI, subdivision B, and you can look down to (2)(a) and (2)(b) and that governs. And the amendment that was made in the Emmons County ordinance was made to specifically an existing provision at B(2)(b)(i). And there were setbacks.  And what I want to point out specifically and importantly is that at the top of this page, prior to Emmons County amending its ordinance to bring CO2 companies within its purview, it already regulated pipelines. And it regulated electric transmission facilities as well as transmission pipelines for water, gas, oil, or coal slurry.  And so this wasn't a situation where Emmons County developed a new ordinance specifically related to pipelines as a land use in their county. They simply, for the first time ever, saw a pipeline coming through
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	rules and processes for different parts of the single pipeline.  Again, the recent federal decision from Iowa, the court discusses the policy reasons for statewide rather than county-by-county siting. And while it's not directly applying North Dakota law, it does support the sort of distinction that the language in the legislation used, language that clearly provides that a permit for a liquid transmission facility preempts local land use regulations.  Summit respectfully asks the Commission to find the Burleigh and Emmons County ordinances preempted or that they will be preempted by a permit if this  Commission grants one as the to the extent that they purport to apply to this project and to treat this multi-county pipeline as a unified, uniform state issue.  Thank you. I'd be happy to answer any questions.  ALJ HOGAN: All right. Thank you.  Are there any questions from commissioners or Mr. Dawson?  All right. No questions.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	upon what happened in that particular county in Iowa.  And that is a different analysis than what happened in Emmons County, North Dakota.  So the Emmons County ordinance regulates land uses in the county and it was amended after the siting application, but one of the things that I handed out to folks is just a couple pages out of the prior Emmons County ordinance. And this is Article VI, subdivision B, and you can look down to (2)(a) and (2)(b) and that governs. And the amendment that was made in the Emmons County ordinance was made to specifically an existing provision at B(2)(b)(i). And there were setbacks.  And what I want to point out specifically and importantly is that at the top of this page, prior to Emmons County amending its ordinance to bring CO2 companies within its purview, it already regulated pipelines. And it regulated electric transmission facilities as well as transmission pipelines for water, gas, oil, or coal slurry.  And so this wasn't a situation where Emmons County developed a new ordinance specifically related to pipelines as a land use in their county. They simply,

### December 21, 2023, Formal Hearing ND PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

we had seen before. Just like at some point in this 2 country no one had heard about the idea of a coal slurry 3 pipeline, but once we heard about the idea of coal 4 slurry pipelines, local governments added those to the 5 other pipelines they regulate. 6 Similarly, when Emmons County found out that

7

8

9

10

11

12

17

21

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

there was going to be a CO2 pipeline coming through, they thought it prudent to regulate that the way they regulate other pipelines. They didn't know the route. What they did is look at their ordinance, what already existed on the books there to regulate that land use, and they added a new land use being developed into the existing land uses being regulated for that purpose.

13 14 Significantly, what they amended is in 15 Article VI. Article VI regulates four different land 16 uses. One of them is the pipelines and transmission facilities I mentioned. And you don't have this in 18 front of you, but the other land uses regulated in 19 Article VI are commercial recreation parks, tourist and 20 trailer camps, salvage and junkyards, and subsurface mining and surface extraction. 22

And my point with that is simply that this is merely one of four different land uses being regulated under the Emmons County ordinance since the 1980s. And so the idea that this was some sort of a safety

PAGE 21

19

20

21

22

23

24

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

government and local control, and it specifically 2 referred to local governments have implemented

3 authorities and they've seen localities consider various

4 measures. One of them is restricting land use and

development along pipeline rights of way through zoning

6 setbacks and similar measures. That's PHMSA saying that

7 they recognize that local governments exercise that

8 jurisdiction. And that's precisely what Emmons County

9 did here.

10 PHMSA's letter to Summit also states "Local 11 governments have traditionally exercised broad powers to 12 regulate land use, including setback distances and 13 property development that includes development in the 14 vicinity of pipelines. Nothing in the federal pipeline 15 safety law impinges on these traditional prerogatives of 16 local or state government, so long as officials do not 17 attempt to regulate the field of pipeline safety 18 preempted by federal law."

There's nothing about regulating pipeline safety in the Emmons County ordinance. And if you go through the briefing, what you'll see is all the comments about that refer to Burleigh County and then attempt to simply sweep up Emmons County with it. The Emmons County ordinance doesn't regulate safety. It is a land use

25 regulation which even PHMSA has recognized is

PAGE 23

regulation passed and targeted at Summit is simply wrong. This has been on the books. And they are still regulating oil and gas lines and transmission lines the same way Summit's being regulated.

The other thing I want to say about the Emmons County ordinance is that they have a process set up where you can get waivers. And so Summit could go to anyone who is within that -- that established residence setback and ask for a waiver. And if they have setbacks that are preventing them from going down the current route, they could simply ask for setbacks to that.

And Commissioner Magrum is here and he can testify. He obviously doesn't know everything that happens in his county, but he hasn't heard of Summit asking for any setbacks in that county -- or setback

But my point is that there is a process even if one of these setbacks poses a problem for the current route. There's actually a process where they can go out and attempt to work with those landowners to get through. And we're not aware of them having even attempted to do that.

The other thing I want to point out is that it was filed with the Commission that there was a letter that was sent out by PHMSA that talked about local

1 specifically the prerogative of local governments.

2 The other issue I want to talk a little bit 3 about is the statutory interpretation. And I think you

probably have several copies at this point, but because

5 we are talking about a fairly wordy and verbose statute.

I thought it would be helpful to have the language in

7 front of you as I refer to it. But what I want to do is

8 walk briefly through some of that language and explain

9 why we disagree with the statutory interpretation and a

10 plain language reading of the statute itself.

And so there was an argument from Summit in which it said that the word "requirements" in subsection 2(c) of 49-22.1-13 is a reference to the road use agreements and that's the argument they're making.

And so if you look at the language in subdivision 2(c), in the second sentence it says "A permit may supersede and preempt the requirements of a political subdivision." And their claim is that that refers to the prior sentence where it says "road use agreements." That's wrong.

If you read the rest of that sentence, it says "A permit may supersede and preempt the requirements of a political subdivision if the applicant shows by a preponderance of the evidence the regulations and ordinances are unreasonably restrictive."

PAGE 22

### December 21, 2023, Formal Hearing ND PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1 My point is that "requirements" is synonymous 2 with regulations and ordinances. They are in the same 3 sentence and they are referring to the same thing. 4 "Requirements" does not refer to road use agreements. 5 It refers to regulations and ordinances. What 6 regulations? The zoning regulations referred to in

8 Summit says that if there is no automatic 9 preemption, then subdivision b is superfluous. Again, 10 that's wrong by its plain language.

11 When you look at subdivision b, it starts with 12 the words "Except as provided in this section." 13 "Section" refers to 49-22.1-13 of the Century Code. 14 That subdivision b is literally referring to the 15 remainder of the section, indicating that you have to 16 look elsewhere in that section to fully understand what 17 that subdivision means because it's saying it may be

superseded except as provided in this section.

"As provided in this section" refers to the language in subdivision c that then explains how, why, and when a local regulation or ordinance can be superseded. Again, regulation or ordinance does not refer to a road use agreement. That very clearly refers to local zoning regulations and ordinances. And so they

17

18

19

20

21

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

do need to make a showing by a preponderance of the

make explicit that they're having their ordinance

2 superseded? That doesn't make any sense. It doesn't

3 make sense that you would say that they are

4 automatically superseded and preempted if you don't get

them filed if they're automatically superseded and

6 preempted anyway. That's not how statutory

7 interpretation works.

8 So the arguments made by Summit with respect to 9 the plain language, I do agree that the legislative 10 history is, at best, ambiguous and supports what both 11 sides are saying depending on which part of it you want 12 to quote. And that is often the case with legislative 13 history. But we don't need to look at the legislative 14 history. We have the language of the statute and we can 15 interpret. And the canons' interpretation say that we 16 give the words their plain and ordinary meaning. We

make sense together. And we have to interpret them to avoid an absurdity. It would be indeed absurd to require local governments to file ordinances that are automatically

have to interpret these provisions together so that they

22 superseded by a permit. And it would also be absurd to 23 say that if you don't get them filed by ten days before

24 the hearing, we're going to automatically supersede them

25 even though we already automatically supersede them.

PAGE 25

PAGE 27

1 evidence.

7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

subdivision b.

Now, moving on, the other language in (d) and (d) -- (d) and (e) further supports this. And specifically if you look at subdivision (d), the last two sentences, it says "Upon notification, a political

subdivision shall provide a listing to the commission of

7 all local requirements identified under this

8 subsection."

> Again, requirements are the local zoning ordinance, not the road use agreement. So they provide their local requirements.

And it states "The requirements must be filed at least ten days before the hearing or the requirements are superseded and preempted." Well, if they're automatically superseded and preempted under subdivision b, then why are they being automatically superseded and preempted if you don't file them ten days before the hearing? That, again, would be superfluous.

The answer is that subdivision b doesn't create an automatic preemption, because that would make subdivision d absurd. That would mean the only reason these local governments are filing their ordinances is to make sure we all know exactly what's being superseded. What possible incentive would they have to be filing them if the only effect of filing them is to

1 That simply doesn't make sense.

2 The bottom line here as well is that, thus far, 3 Summit has not produced or proffered or submitted the

4 evidence required for the PSC to make a finding on this

5 issue. They have an evidentiary burden of proof. They

have to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that 6

7 it's unreasonably restrictive. They have to show

8 there's a conflict. They have to show one of these

9 things and that has to be in the findings of the

10 Commission. And if it's not, then the Commission's 11

order would be reversible.

Without an evidentiary hearing and without a significant amount of evidence that is right now lacking in the record, the Commission simply doesn't have the evidence necessary in order to make a finding to supersede a local ordinance. And it specifically doesn't have any evidence in the record to supersede the Emmons County ordinance.

And as I have shown and explained, there's no conflict between the Emmons County ordinance and any state or federal law. So, with that, we would ask for the Commission to require Summit, in any event, to put on evidence first if it wants ordinance superseded.

Now we're not going to agree that our ordinance is unreasonably restrictive. Summit has submitted a map

PAGE 26

	IND PUBLIC SERV		
1	with no foundation indicating that it can't get through.	1	MR. BRAATEN: I won't say that I think that
2	Number one, we don't agree with everything that appears	2	would be illogical. I think that it would be contrary
3	to be on that map and there's no foundation as to how	3	to the plain language of the statute if you read it
4	that map was created and that's not competent evidence.	4	together, and particularly when they use "requirements,"
5	Even if that map were accurate, which, again, we don't	5	they use that synonymously with words like "regulations
6	agree it is, even if it were, they haven't attempted to	6	or ordinances."
7	get any waivers to get through, which is a way they can	7	There's only one place in this entire statute
8	get through. So, again, it's not stopping them.	8	that refers to road use agreements. And what I would
9	They're simply not trying to get through.	9	say is that that makes it clear that the Legislature
10	So, with that, the Emmons County ordinance is a	10	knows very well how to refer to road use agreements, and
11	unique ordinance that has not been analyzed. Summit has	11	if that's what they meant, they would have just said
12	not proffered evidence. There's not evidence in the	12	road use agreements. When they're talking about
13	record sufficient for the finding required in order to	13	ordinances and regulations, I think it's clear from the
14	supersede the local ordinance. And so we would ask you	14	language what they're referring to is zoning ordinances
15	to deny Summit's motion on this issue.	15	and zoning regulations.
16	With that, I would stand for any questions.	16	And, therefore, I don't again, I'm not saying
17	Thank you.	17	what you stated, Commissioner Christmann, was illogical,
18	ALJ HOGAN: Thank you.	18	but I don't think it complies with the canons of
19	Are there any questions from the commissioners	19	interpretation and I don't think that it's a fair
20	or Mr. Dawson?	20	reading of the plain language of this statute.
21	COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Yes, Your Honor.	21	COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Okay. And my last
22	I've seen this one page before that you handed	22	question, how do you explain and correct me if I'm
23	out just earlier. So am I understanding you right, the	23	wrong here, but my understanding of this whole section
24	previous ordinance from the '80s having to do with	24	of law is that sections b and c, until, I think, 2019,
25	pipelines had a 200-foot setback from occupied	25	give or take one session, were actually one section with
	PAGE 29		PAGE 31
	structures and then was the the previous attorney	1	some language that's been removed, some new language
1	su actures and then was the the previous attorney		some language that's been removed, some new language
2	correct when he said that it's currently gone from 200	2	added in, but previously the whole thing was combined
2	correct when he said that it's currently gone from 200	2	added in, but previously the whole thing was combined
2	correct when he said that it's currently gone from 200 feet to 8,000 feet?	2	added in, but previously the whole thing was combined and it said that the commission's permit may supersede
2 3 4	correct when he said that it's currently gone from 200 feet to 8,000 feet?  MR. BRAATEN: It went from 200 feet for a	2 3 4	added in, but previously the whole thing was combined and it said that the commission's permit may supersede or preempt.
2 3 4 5	correct when he said that it's currently gone from 200 feet to 8,000 feet?  MR. BRAATEN: It went from 200 feet for a building and the current actually splits that out.	2 3 4 5	added in, but previously the whole thing was combined and it said that the commission's permit may supersede or preempt.  What's your theory on why did the Legislature
2 3 4 5 6	correct when he said that it's currently gone from 200 feet to 8,000 feet?  MR. BRAATEN: It went from 200 feet for a building and the current actually splits that out.  So there are established residences that have a setback,	2 3 4 5 6	added in, but previously the whole thing was combined and it said that the commission's permit may supersede or preempt.  What's your theory on why did the Legislature change that to say that we preempt and supersede on part
2 3 4 5 6 7	correct when he said that it's currently gone from 200 feet to 8,000 feet?  MR. BRAATEN: It went from 200 feet for a building and the current actually splits that out.  So there are established residences that have a setback, corporate boundaries of organized city, and then it's	2 3 4 5 6 7	added in, but previously the whole thing was combined and it said that the commission's permit may supersede or preempt.  What's your theory on why did the Legislature change that to say that we preempt and supersede on part of it and then create another section about road use
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	correct when he said that it's currently gone from 200 feet to 8,000 feet?  MR. BRAATEN: It went from 200 feet for a building and the current actually splits that out.  So there are established residences that have a setback, corporate boundaries of organized city, and then it's 500 feet for any other building or surface water body.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	added in, but previously the whole thing was combined and it said that the commission's permit may supersede or preempt.  What's your theory on why did the Legislature change that to say that we preempt and supersede on part of it and then create another section about road use agreements and there say that we may if they're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	correct when he said that it's currently gone from 200 feet to 8,000 feet?  MR. BRAATEN: It went from 200 feet for a building and the current actually splits that out.  So there are established residences that have a setback, corporate boundaries of organized city, and then it's 500 feet for any other building or surface water body.  So that 200 for any building was split up	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	added in, but previously the whole thing was combined and it said that the commission's permit may supersede or preempt.  What's your theory on why did the Legislature change that to say that we preempt and supersede on part of it and then create another section about road use agreements and there say that we may if they're unreasonably restrictive?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	correct when he said that it's currently gone from 200 feet to 8,000 feet?  MR. BRAATEN: It went from 200 feet for a building and the current actually splits that out.  So there are established residences that have a setback, corporate boundaries of organized city, and then it's 500 feet for any other building or surface water body.  So that 200 for any building was split up further and the more significant setback is for an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	added in, but previously the whole thing was combined and it said that the commission's permit may supersede or preempt.  What's your theory on why did the Legislature change that to say that we preempt and supersede on part of it and then create another section about road use agreements and there say that we may if they're unreasonably restrictive?  MR. BRAATEN: Thank you, Commissioner
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	correct when he said that it's currently gone from 200 feet to 8,000 feet?  MR. BRAATEN: It went from 200 feet for a building and the current actually splits that out.  So there are established residences that have a setback, corporate boundaries of organized city, and then it's 500 feet for any other building or surface water body.  So that 200 for any building was split up further and the more significant setback is for an established residence, but then for simply a building,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	added in, but previously the whole thing was combined and it said that the commission's permit may supersede or preempt.  What's your theory on why did the Legislature change that to say that we preempt and supersede on part of it and then create another section about road use agreements and there say that we may if they're unreasonably restrictive?  MR. BRAATEN: Thank you, Commissioner Christmann.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	correct when he said that it's currently gone from 200 feet to 8,000 feet?  MR. BRAATEN: It went from 200 feet for a building and the current actually splits that out.  So there are established residences that have a setback, corporate boundaries of organized city, and then it's 500 feet for any other building or surface water body.  So that 200 for any building was split up further and the more significant setback is for an established residence, but then for simply a building, which is what the prior ordinance said was 200 feet,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	added in, but previously the whole thing was combined and it said that the commission's permit may supersede or preempt.  What's your theory on why did the Legislature change that to say that we preempt and supersede on part of it and then create another section about road use agreements and there say that we may if they're unreasonably restrictive?  MR. BRAATEN: Thank you, Commissioner Christmann.  And what I would say is I don't think that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	correct when he said that it's currently gone from 200 feet to 8,000 feet?  MR. BRAATEN: It went from 200 feet for a building and the current actually splits that out.  So there are established residences that have a setback, corporate boundaries of organized city, and then it's 500 feet for any other building or surface water body.  So that 200 for any building was split up further and the more significant setback is for an established residence, but then for simply a building, which is what the prior ordinance said was 200 feet, that was increased to 500 feet.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	added in, but previously the whole thing was combined and it said that the commission's permit may supersede or preempt.  What's your theory on why did the Legislature change that to say that we preempt and supersede on part of it and then create another section about road use agreements and there say that we may if they're unreasonably restrictive?  MR. BRAATEN: Thank you, Commissioner Christmann.  And what I would say is I don't think that subsection c is a subsection just on road agreements. I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	correct when he said that it's currently gone from 200 feet to 8,000 feet?  MR. BRAATEN: It went from 200 feet for a building and the current actually splits that out. So there are established residences that have a setback, corporate boundaries of organized city, and then it's 500 feet for any other building or surface water body.  So that 200 for any building was split up further and the more significant setback is for an established residence, but then for simply a building, which is what the prior ordinance said was 200 feet, that was increased to 500 feet.  COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Okay. And then I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	added in, but previously the whole thing was combined and it said that the commission's permit may supersede or preempt.  What's your theory on why did the Legislature change that to say that we preempt and supersede on part of it and then create another section about road use agreements and there say that we may if they're unreasonably restrictive?  MR. BRAATEN: Thank you, Commissioner Christmann.  And what I would say is I don't think that subsection c is a subsection just on road agreements. I think it refers to road agreements.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	correct when he said that it's currently gone from 200 feet to 8,000 feet?  MR. BRAATEN: It went from 200 feet for a building and the current actually splits that out. So there are established residences that have a setback, corporate boundaries of organized city, and then it's 500 feet for any other building or surface water body.  So that 200 for any building was split up further and the more significant setback is for an established residence, but then for simply a building, which is what the prior ordinance said was 200 feet, that was increased to 500 feet.  COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Okay. And then I'm not quoting you, but I understood you to say that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	added in, but previously the whole thing was combined and it said that the commission's permit may supersede or preempt.  What's your theory on why did the Legislature change that to say that we preempt and supersede on part of it and then create another section about road use agreements and there say that we may if they're unreasonably restrictive?  MR. BRAATEN: Thank you, Commissioner Christmann.  And what I would say is I don't think that subsection c is a subsection just on road agreements. I think it refers to road agreements.  With respect to the fact that the Legislature
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	correct when he said that it's currently gone from 200 feet to 8,000 feet?  MR. BRAATEN: It went from 200 feet for a building and the current actually splits that out.  So there are established residences that have a setback, corporate boundaries of organized city, and then it's 500 feet for any other building or surface water body.  So that 200 for any building was split up further and the more significant setback is for an established residence, but then for simply a building, which is what the prior ordinance said was 200 feet, that was increased to 500 feet.  COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Okay. And then I'm not quoting you, but I understood you to say that the way Summit is arguing, there would be no logic to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	added in, but previously the whole thing was combined and it said that the commission's permit may supersede or preempt.  What's your theory on why did the Legislature change that to say that we preempt and supersede on part of it and then create another section about road use agreements and there say that we may if they're unreasonably restrictive?  MR. BRAATEN: Thank you, Commissioner Christmann.  And what I would say is I don't think that subsection c is a subsection just on road agreements. I think it refers to road agreements.  With respect to the fact that the Legislature went through a legislative process and made those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	correct when he said that it's currently gone from 200 feet to 8,000 feet?  MR. BRAATEN: It went from 200 feet for a building and the current actually splits that out. So there are established residences that have a setback, corporate boundaries of organized city, and then it's 500 feet for any other building or surface water body.  So that 200 for any building was split up further and the more significant setback is for an established residence, but then for simply a building, which is what the prior ordinance said was 200 feet, that was increased to 500 feet.  COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Okay. And then I'm not quoting you, but I understood you to say that the way Summit is arguing, there would be no logic to the requirement that the local government turn in their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	added in, but previously the whole thing was combined and it said that the commission's permit may supersede or preempt.  What's your theory on why did the Legislature change that to say that we preempt and supersede on part of it and then create another section about road use agreements and there say that we may if they're unreasonably restrictive?  MR. BRAATEN: Thank you, Commissioner Christmann.  And what I would say is I don't think that subsection c is a subsection just on road agreements. I think it refers to road agreements.  With respect to the fact that the Legislature went through a legislative process and made those changes, I have two answers. The short, flippant answer
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	correct when he said that it's currently gone from 200 feet to 8,000 feet?  MR. BRAATEN: It went from 200 feet for a building and the current actually splits that out. So there are established residences that have a setback, corporate boundaries of organized city, and then it's 500 feet for any other building or surface water body.  So that 200 for any building was split up further and the more significant setback is for an established residence, but then for simply a building, which is what the prior ordinance said was 200 feet, that was increased to 500 feet.  COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Okay. And then I'm not quoting you, but I understood you to say that the way Summit is arguing, there would be no logic to the requirement that the local government turn in their ordinances ten days in advance if things are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	added in, but previously the whole thing was combined and it said that the commission's permit may supersede or preempt.  What's your theory on why did the Legislature change that to say that we preempt and supersede on part of it and then create another section about road use agreements and there say that we may if they're unreasonably restrictive?  MR. BRAATEN: Thank you, Commissioner Christmann.  And what I would say is I don't think that subsection c is a subsection just on road agreements. I think it refers to road agreements.  With respect to the fact that the Legislature went through a legislative process and made those changes, I have two answers. The short, flippant answer is that it's a sausage factory.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	correct when he said that it's currently gone from 200 feet to 8,000 feet?  MR. BRAATEN: It went from 200 feet for a building and the current actually splits that out. So there are established residences that have a setback, corporate boundaries of organized city, and then it's 500 feet for any other building or surface water body.  So that 200 for any building was split up further and the more significant setback is for an established residence, but then for simply a building, which is what the prior ordinance said was 200 feet, that was increased to 500 feet.  COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Okay. And then I'm not quoting you, but I understood you to say that the way Summit is arguing, there would be no logic to the requirement that the local government turn in their ordinances ten days in advance if things are automatically superseded.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	added in, but previously the whole thing was combined and it said that the commission's permit may supersede or preempt.  What's your theory on why did the Legislature change that to say that we preempt and supersede on part of it and then create another section about road use agreements and there say that we may if they're unreasonably restrictive?  MR. BRAATEN: Thank you, Commissioner Christmann.  And what I would say is I don't think that subsection c is a subsection just on road agreements. I think it refers to road agreements.  With respect to the fact that the Legislature went through a legislative process and made those changes, I have two answers. The short, flippant answer is that it's a sausage factory.  Putting that aside, my serious answer about it,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	correct when he said that it's currently gone from 200 feet to 8,000 feet?  MR. BRAATEN: It went from 200 feet for a building and the current actually splits that out.  So there are established residences that have a setback, corporate boundaries of organized city, and then it's 500 feet for any other building or surface water body.  So that 200 for any building was split up further and the more significant setback is for an established residence, but then for simply a building, which is what the prior ordinance said was 200 feet, that was increased to 500 feet.  COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Okay. And then I'm not quoting you, but I understood you to say that the way Summit is arguing, there would be no logic to the requirement that the local government turn in their ordinances ten days in advance if things are automatically superseded.  But would it be illogical to read that to mean	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	added in, but previously the whole thing was combined and it said that the commission's permit may supersede or preempt.  What's your theory on why did the Legislature change that to say that we preempt and supersede on part of it and then create another section about road use agreements and there say that we may if they're unreasonably restrictive?  MR. BRAATEN: Thank you, Commissioner Christmann.  And what I would say is I don't think that subsection c is a subsection just on road agreements. I think it refers to road agreements.  With respect to the fact that the Legislature went through a legislative process and made those changes, I have two answers. The short, flippant answer is that it's a sausage factory.  Putting that aside, my serious answer about it, however, is that if you look at that legislative
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	correct when he said that it's currently gone from 200 feet to 8,000 feet?  MR. BRAATEN: It went from 200 feet for a building and the current actually splits that out.  So there are established residences that have a setback, corporate boundaries of organized city, and then it's 500 feet for any other building or surface water body.  So that 200 for any building was split up further and the more significant setback is for an established residence, but then for simply a building, which is what the prior ordinance said was 200 feet, that was increased to 500 feet.  COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Okay. And then I'm not quoting you, but I understood you to say that the way Summit is arguing, there would be no logic to the requirement that the local government turn in their ordinances ten days in advance if things are automatically superseded.  But would it be illogical to read that to mean that they need to be turned in ten days in advance so	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	added in, but previously the whole thing was combined and it said that the commission's permit may supersede or preempt.  What's your theory on why did the Legislature change that to say that we preempt and supersede on part of it and then create another section about road use agreements and there say that we may if they're unreasonably restrictive?  MR. BRAATEN: Thank you, Commissioner Christmann.  And what I would say is I don't think that subsection c is a subsection just on road agreements. I think it refers to road agreements.  With respect to the fact that the Legislature went through a legislative process and made those changes, I have two answers. The short, flippant answer is that it's a sausage factory.  Putting that aside, my serious answer about it, however, is that if you look at that legislative history, what you see is that there was an intent to try
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	correct when he said that it's currently gone from 200 feet to 8,000 feet?  MR. BRAATEN: It went from 200 feet for a building and the current actually splits that out.  So there are established residences that have a setback, corporate boundaries of organized city, and then it's 500 feet for any other building or surface water body.  So that 200 for any building was split up further and the more significant setback is for an established residence, but then for simply a building, which is what the prior ordinance said was 200 feet, that was increased to 500 feet.  COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Okay. And then I'm not quoting you, but I understood you to say that the way Summit is arguing, there would be no logic to the requirement that the local government turn in their ordinances ten days in advance if things are automatically superseded.  But would it be illogical to read that to mean that they need to be turned in ten days in advance so that the commission could determine if, among those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	added in, but previously the whole thing was combined and it said that the commission's permit may supersede or preempt.  What's your theory on why did the Legislature change that to say that we preempt and supersede on part of it and then create another section about road use agreements and there say that we may if they're unreasonably restrictive?  MR. BRAATEN: Thank you, Commissioner Christmann.  And what I would say is I don't think that subsection c is a subsection just on road agreements. I think it refers to road agreements.  With respect to the fact that the Legislature went through a legislative process and made those changes, I have two answers. The short, flippant answer is that it's a sausage factory.  Putting that aside, my serious answer about it, however, is that if you look at that legislative history, what you see is that there was an intent to try and change the statute and there were also a lot of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	correct when he said that it's currently gone from 200 feet to 8,000 feet?  MR. BRAATEN: It went from 200 feet for a building and the current actually splits that out. So there are established residences that have a setback, corporate boundaries of organized city, and then it's 500 feet for any other building or surface water body.  So that 200 for any building was split up further and the more significant setback is for an established residence, but then for simply a building, which is what the prior ordinance said was 200 feet, that was increased to 500 feet.  COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Okay. And then I'm not quoting you, but I understood you to say that the way Summit is arguing, there would be no logic to the requirement that the local government turn in their ordinances ten days in advance if things are automatically superseded.  But would it be illogical to read that to mean that they need to be turned in ten days in advance so that the commission could determine if, among those ordinances, there are road use agreements and then	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	added in, but previously the whole thing was combined and it said that the commission's permit may supersede or preempt.  What's your theory on why did the Legislature change that to say that we preempt and supersede on part of it and then create another section about road use agreements and there say that we may if they're unreasonably restrictive?  MR. BRAATEN: Thank you, Commissioner  Christmann.  And what I would say is I don't think that subsection c is a subsection just on road agreements. I think it refers to road agreements.  With respect to the fact that the Legislature went through a legislative process and made those changes, I have two answers. The short, flippant answer is that it's a sausage factory.  Putting that aside, my serious answer about it, however, is that if you look at that legislative history, what you see is that there was an intent to try and change the statute and there were also a lot of legislators who said that "We believe local control is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	feet to 8,000 feet?  MR. BRAATEN: It went from 200 feet for a building and the current actually splits that out.  So there are established residences that have a setback, corporate boundaries of organized city, and then it's 500 feet for any other building or surface water body.  So that 200 for any building was split up further and the more significant setback is for an established residence, but then for simply a building, which is what the prior ordinance said was 200 feet, that was increased to 500 feet.  COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Okay. And then I'm not quoting you, but I understood you to say that the way Summit is arguing, there would be no logic to the requirement that the local government turn in their ordinances ten days in advance if things are automatically superseded.  But would it be illogical to read that to mean that they need to be turned in ten days in advance so that the commission could determine if, among those ordinances, there are road use agreements and then whether those are or not unreasonably restrictive	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	added in, but previously the whole thing was combined and it said that the commission's permit may supersede or preempt.  What's your theory on why did the Legislature change that to say that we preempt and supersede on part of it and then create another section about road use agreements and there say that we may if they're unreasonably restrictive?  MR. BRAATEN: Thank you, Commissioner Christmann.  And what I would say is I don't think that subsection c is a subsection just on road agreements. I think it refers to road agreements.  With respect to the fact that the Legislature went through a legislative process and made those changes, I have two answers. The short, flippant answer is that it's a sausage factory.  Putting that aside, my serious answer about it, however, is that if you look at that legislative history, what you see is that there was an intent to try and change the statute and there were also a lot of legislators who said that "We believe local control is critical and extremely important." And this is the

1	IND I OBEIG GEITV	ı	
1	when those different sides started arguing at the	1	The second ordinance that they reference would
2	Legislature.	2	be the one that they designate, I believe, as the
3	And as attorneys and as a body here, our	3	March 30th ordinance. That one is a zoning ordinance
4	obligation is not to speculate about why they would have	4	within Burleigh County.
5	done that or didn't do it. Our obligation is to look at	5	Burleigh County does not have zoning authority
6	the language in the statute and interpret it.	6	through every township within the county. Some
7	And so my argument and my point is that, putting	7	townships retain their own zoning ordinance authority.
8	aside why the Legislature did what they did, I think	8	And so there was a map that was attached to our petition
9	that's the danger in looking at legislative history when	9	to intervene as Exhibit 2 which shows which townships
10	the language itself is not ambiguous. And so that's why	10	are subject to the Burleigh County zoning authority.
11	I agree with Summit that we don't want to be looking at	11	So with that zoning ordinance that was passed in
12	that legislative history because I think that both sides	12	Burleigh County, there are multiple townships where that
13	can make some pretty good arguments from various	13	zoning ordinance does not apply. They would have to
14	comments they find in that legislative history, but,	14	adopt their own. So there is still a pathway through
15	ultimately, what a court is going to do and what our	15	Burleigh County outside of the Burleigh County zoning
16	obligation is, is to interpret the language in front of	16	ordinance where Summit could reroute their pipeline.
17	us.	17	When we're talking about 49-22.1-13 of the North
18	COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Thank you. No other	18	Dakota Century Code and talking about superseding and
19	questions.	19	preempting local zoning ordinances, it's important to
20	COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: No questions.	20	note that that statute talks about issuance of a
21	ALJ HOGAN: All right. Thank you.	21	certificate and issuance of a permit. Those are two
22	The next party on my list is Burleigh County so	22	different things. And those are defined in the
23	you can proceed, Ms. Lawyer.	23	beginning of the statute as well under 49-22.1-01.
24	MS. LAWYER: Thank you, Judge Hogan,	24	A "certificate" means a certificate of site
25	Commissioners. I'm Julie Lawyer, representing Burleigh	25	compatibility or the certificate of corridor
	PAGE 33		PAGE 35
1	County.	1	compatibility issued under this chapter. A permit is
2	We're talking about two different ordinances in	2	different. The permit, under subsection 8, is a permit
_	Burleigh County that were brought up in the original	3	e
3	baneigh County that were brought up in the original	J 3	for construction of the gas or liquid transmission
4	motion by Summit when they talked about superseding the	4	for construction of the gas or liquid transmission facility within the designated corridor.
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
4	motion by Summit when they talked about superseding the	4	facility within the designated corridor.
4 5	motion by Summit when they talked about superseding the Burleigh County ordinances. The first ordinance, which	4 5	facility within the designated corridor.  So we're talking about two things. The
4 5 6	motion by Summit when they talked about superseding the Burleigh County ordinances. The first ordinance, which they identify as the March 6th ordinance, was a	4 5 6	facility within the designated corridor.  So we're talking about two things. The certificate basically approves of the location of the pipeline. The permit allows them to build then the
4 5 6 7	motion by Summit when they talked about superseding the Burleigh County ordinances. The first ordinance, which they identify as the March 6th ordinance, was a countywide ordinance adopted under the county's Home	4 5 6 7	facility within the designated corridor.  So we're talking about two things. The certificate basically approves of the location of the
4 5 6 7 8	motion by Summit when they talked about superseding the Burleigh County ordinances. The first ordinance, which they identify as the March 6th ordinance, was a countywide ordinance adopted under the county's Home Rule Charter, and that ordinance dealt with basically	4 5 6 7 8	facility within the designated corridor.  So we're talking about two things. The certificate basically approves of the location of the pipeline. The permit allows them to build then the pipeline at that location that was approved.
4 5 6 7 8 9	motion by Summit when they talked about superseding the Burleigh County ordinances. The first ordinance, which they identify as the March 6th ordinance, was a countywide ordinance adopted under the county's Home Rule Charter, and that ordinance dealt with basically sharing of information from a pipeline company to	4 5 6 7 8 9	facility within the designated corridor.  So we're talking about two things. The certificate basically approves of the location of the pipeline. The permit allows them to build then the pipeline at that location that was approved.  So when you're looking, again, at 49-22.1-13,
4 5 6 7 8 9 10	motion by Summit when they talked about superseding the Burleigh County ordinances. The first ordinance, which they identify as the March 6th ordinance, was a countywide ordinance adopted under the county's Home Rule Charter, and that ordinance dealt with basically sharing of information from a pipeline company to provide safety information to the county so that the	4 5 6 7 8 9	facility within the designated corridor.  So we're talking about two things. The certificate basically approves of the location of the pipeline. The permit allows them to build then the pipeline at that location that was approved.  So when you're looking, again, at 49-22.1-13, under subsection 2, 2(b) indicates "Except as provided"
4 5 6 7 8 9 10	motion by Summit when they talked about superseding the Burleigh County ordinances. The first ordinance, which they identify as the March 6th ordinance, was a countywide ordinance adopted under the county's Home Rule Charter, and that ordinance dealt with basically sharing of information from a pipeline company to provide safety information to the county so that the county would be able to train and have first responders	4 5 6 7 8 9 10	facility within the designated corridor.  So we're talking about two things. The certificate basically approves of the location of the pipeline. The permit allows them to build then the pipeline at that location that was approved.  So when you're looking, again, at 49-22.1-13, under subsection 2, 2(b) indicates "Except as provided in this section, a permit for the construction of a gas
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	motion by Summit when they talked about superseding the Burleigh County ordinances. The first ordinance, which they identify as the March 6th ordinance, was a countywide ordinance adopted under the county's Home Rule Charter, and that ordinance dealt with basically sharing of information from a pipeline company to provide safety information to the county so that the county would be able to train and have first responders able to take care of any emergency that arose.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	facility within the designated corridor.  So we're talking about two things. The certificate basically approves of the location of the pipeline. The permit allows them to build then the pipeline at that location that was approved.  So when you're looking, again, at 49-22.1-13, under subsection 2, 2(b) indicates "Except as provided in this section, a permit for the construction of a gas or liquid transmission facility within a designated
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	motion by Summit when they talked about superseding the Burleigh County ordinances. The first ordinance, which they identify as the March 6th ordinance, was a countywide ordinance adopted under the county's Home Rule Charter, and that ordinance dealt with basically sharing of information from a pipeline company to provide safety information to the county so that the county would be able to train and have first responders able to take care of any emergency that arose.  That ordinance, again, doesn't regulate the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	facility within the designated corridor.  So we're talking about two things. The certificate basically approves of the location of the pipeline. The permit allows them to build then the pipeline at that location that was approved.  So when you're looking, again, at 49-22.1-13, under subsection 2, 2(b) indicates "Except as provided in this section, a permit for the construction of a gas or liquid transmission facility within a designated corridor supersedes and preempts any local land use or
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	motion by Summit when they talked about superseding the Burleigh County ordinances. The first ordinance, which they identify as the March 6th ordinance, was a countywide ordinance adopted under the county's Home Rule Charter, and that ordinance dealt with basically sharing of information from a pipeline company to provide safety information to the county so that the county would be able to train and have first responders able to take care of any emergency that arose.  That ordinance, again, doesn't regulate the safety of the pipeline or the company, but what it does	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	facility within the designated corridor.  So we're talking about two things. The certificate basically approves of the location of the pipeline. The permit allows them to build then the pipeline at that location that was approved.  So when you're looking, again, at 49-22.1-13, under subsection 2, 2(b) indicates "Except as provided in this section, a permit for the construction of a gas or liquid transmission facility within a designated corridor supersedes and preempts any local land use or zoning regulations."
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	motion by Summit when they talked about superseding the Burleigh County ordinances. The first ordinance, which they identify as the March 6th ordinance, was a countywide ordinance adopted under the county's Home Rule Charter, and that ordinance dealt with basically sharing of information from a pipeline company to provide safety information to the county so that the county would be able to train and have first responders able to take care of any emergency that arose.  That ordinance, again, doesn't regulate the safety of the pipeline or the company, but what it does is it actually puts forth for them to share with the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	facility within the designated corridor.  So we're talking about two things. The certificate basically approves of the location of the pipeline. The permit allows them to build then the pipeline at that location that was approved.  So when you're looking, again, at 49-22.1-13, under subsection 2, 2(b) indicates "Except as provided in this section, a permit for the construction of a gas or liquid transmission facility within a designated corridor supersedes and preempts any local land use or zoning regulations."  We're getting ahead of ourselves there because
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	motion by Summit when they talked about superseding the Burleigh County ordinances. The first ordinance, which they identify as the March 6th ordinance, was a countywide ordinance adopted under the county's Home Rule Charter, and that ordinance dealt with basically sharing of information from a pipeline company to provide safety information to the county so that the county would be able to train and have first responders able to take care of any emergency that arose.  That ordinance, again, doesn't regulate the safety of the pipeline or the company, but what it does is it actually puts forth for them to share with the county an emergency action plan, an emergency response	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	facility within the designated corridor.  So we're talking about two things. The certificate basically approves of the location of the pipeline. The permit allows them to build then the pipeline at that location that was approved.  So when you're looking, again, at 49-22.1-13, under subsection 2, 2(b) indicates "Except as provided in this section, a permit for the construction of a gas or liquid transmission facility within a designated corridor supersedes and preempts any local land use or zoning regulations."  We're getting ahead of ourselves there because we're not talking about a permit to construct the
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	motion by Summit when they talked about superseding the Burleigh County ordinances. The first ordinance, which they identify as the March 6th ordinance, was a countywide ordinance adopted under the county's Home Rule Charter, and that ordinance dealt with basically sharing of information from a pipeline company to provide safety information to the county so that the county would be able to train and have first responders able to take care of any emergency that arose.  That ordinance, again, doesn't regulate the safety of the pipeline or the company, but what it does is it actually puts forth for them to share with the county an emergency action plan, an emergency response and hazard mitigation plan, and safety procedures and	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	facility within the designated corridor.  So we're talking about two things. The certificate basically approves of the location of the pipeline. The permit allows them to build then the pipeline at that location that was approved.  So when you're looking, again, at 49-22.1-13, under subsection 2, 2(b) indicates "Except as provided in this section, a permit for the construction of a gas or liquid transmission facility within a designated corridor supersedes and preempts any local land use or zoning regulations."  We're getting ahead of ourselves there because we're not talking about a permit to construct the pipeline at this point. We're talking about designating
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	motion by Summit when they talked about superseding the Burleigh County ordinances. The first ordinance, which they identify as the March 6th ordinance, was a countywide ordinance adopted under the county's Home Rule Charter, and that ordinance dealt with basically sharing of information from a pipeline company to provide safety information to the county so that the county would be able to train and have first responders able to take care of any emergency that arose.  That ordinance, again, doesn't regulate the safety of the pipeline or the company, but what it does is it actually puts forth for them to share with the county an emergency action plan, an emergency response and hazard mitigation plan, and safety procedures and protocol of the pipeline company so that our first	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	facility within the designated corridor.  So we're talking about two things. The certificate basically approves of the location of the pipeline. The permit allows them to build then the pipeline at that location that was approved.  So when you're looking, again, at 49-22.1-13, under subsection 2, 2(b) indicates "Except as provided in this section, a permit for the construction of a gas or liquid transmission facility within a designated corridor supersedes and preempts any local land use or zoning regulations."  We're getting ahead of ourselves there because we're not talking about a permit to construct the pipeline at this point. We're talking about designating that corridor or giving that site compatibility
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	motion by Summit when they talked about superseding the Burleigh County ordinances. The first ordinance, which they identify as the March 6th ordinance, was a countywide ordinance adopted under the county's Home Rule Charter, and that ordinance dealt with basically sharing of information from a pipeline company to provide safety information to the county so that the county would be able to train and have first responders able to take care of any emergency that arose.  That ordinance, again, doesn't regulate the safety of the pipeline or the company, but what it does is it actually puts forth for them to share with the county an emergency action plan, an emergency response and hazard mitigation plan, and safety procedures and protocol of the pipeline company so that our first responders would have that information, our emergency	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	facility within the designated corridor.  So we're talking about two things. The certificate basically approves of the location of the pipeline. The permit allows them to build then the pipeline at that location that was approved.  So when you're looking, again, at 49-22.1-13, under subsection 2, 2(b) indicates "Except as provided in this section, a permit for the construction of a gas or liquid transmission facility within a designated corridor supersedes and preempts any local land use or zoning regulations."  We're getting ahead of ourselves there because we're not talking about a permit to construct the pipeline at this point. We're talking about designating that corridor or giving that site compatibility certificate to give them the location that they can
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	motion by Summit when they talked about superseding the Burleigh County ordinances. The first ordinance, which they identify as the March 6th ordinance, was a countywide ordinance adopted under the county's Home Rule Charter, and that ordinance dealt with basically sharing of information from a pipeline company to provide safety information to the county so that the county would be able to train and have first responders able to take care of any emergency that arose.  That ordinance, again, doesn't regulate the safety of the pipeline or the company, but what it does is it actually puts forth for them to share with the county an emergency action plan, an emergency response and hazard mitigation plan, and safety procedures and protocol of the pipeline company so that our first responders would have that information, our emergency management department would have that information, so if	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	facility within the designated corridor.  So we're talking about two things. The certificate basically approves of the location of the pipeline. The permit allows them to build then the pipeline at that location that was approved.  So when you're looking, again, at 49-22.1-13, under subsection 2, 2(b) indicates "Except as provided in this section, a permit for the construction of a gas or liquid transmission facility within a designated corridor supersedes and preempts any local land use or zoning regulations."  We're getting ahead of ourselves there because we're not talking about a permit to construct the pipeline at this point. We're talking about designating that corridor or giving that site compatibility certificate to give them the location that they can build it.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	motion by Summit when they talked about superseding the Burleigh County ordinances. The first ordinance, which they identify as the March 6th ordinance, was a countywide ordinance adopted under the county's Home Rule Charter, and that ordinance dealt with basically sharing of information from a pipeline company to provide safety information to the county so that the county would be able to train and have first responders able to take care of any emergency that arose.  That ordinance, again, doesn't regulate the safety of the pipeline or the company, but what it does is it actually puts forth for them to share with the county an emergency action plan, an emergency response and hazard mitigation plan, and safety procedures and protocol of the pipeline company so that our first responders would have that information, our emergency management department would have that information, so if an emergency did occur, again, we would have the proper	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	facility within the designated corridor.  So we're talking about two things. The certificate basically approves of the location of the pipeline. The permit allows them to build then the pipeline at that location that was approved.  So when you're looking, again, at 49-22.1-13, under subsection 2, 2(b) indicates "Except as provided in this section, a permit for the construction of a gas or liquid transmission facility within a designated corridor supersedes and preempts any local land use or zoning regulations."  We're getting ahead of ourselves there because we're not talking about a permit to construct the pipeline at this point. We're talking about designating that corridor or giving that site compatibility certificate to give them the location that they can build it.  So we have to look at where we're issuing a
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	motion by Summit when they talked about superseding the Burleigh County ordinances. The first ordinance, which they identify as the March 6th ordinance, was a countywide ordinance adopted under the county's Home Rule Charter, and that ordinance dealt with basically sharing of information from a pipeline company to provide safety information to the county so that the county would be able to train and have first responders able to take care of any emergency that arose.  That ordinance, again, doesn't regulate the safety of the pipeline or the company, but what it does is it actually puts forth for them to share with the county an emergency action plan, an emergency response and hazard mitigation plan, and safety procedures and protocol of the pipeline company so that our first responders would have that information, our emergency management department would have that information, so if an emergency did occur, again, we would have the proper training and planning to be able to handle that	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	facility within the designated corridor.  So we're talking about two things. The certificate basically approves of the location of the pipeline. The permit allows them to build then the pipeline at that location that was approved.  So when you're looking, again, at 49-22.1-13, under subsection 2, 2(b) indicates "Except as provided in this section, a permit for the construction of a gas or liquid transmission facility within a designated corridor supersedes and preempts any local land use or zoning regulations."  We're getting ahead of ourselves there because we're not talking about a permit to construct the pipeline at this point. We're talking about designating that corridor or giving that site compatibility certificate to give them the location that they can build it.  So we have to look at where we're issuing a certificate, and that would be under 2(d). "When the
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	motion by Summit when they talked about superseding the Burleigh County ordinances. The first ordinance, which they identify as the March 6th ordinance, was a countywide ordinance adopted under the county's Home Rule Charter, and that ordinance dealt with basically sharing of information from a pipeline company to provide safety information to the county so that the county would be able to train and have first responders able to take care of any emergency that arose.  That ordinance, again, doesn't regulate the safety of the pipeline or the company, but what it does is it actually puts forth for them to share with the county an emergency action plan, an emergency response and hazard mitigation plan, and safety procedures and protocol of the pipeline company so that our first responders would have that information, our emergency management department would have that information, so if an emergency did occur, again, we would have the proper training and planning to be able to handle that emergency. That is a countywide ordinance, again, under	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	facility within the designated corridor.  So we're talking about two things. The certificate basically approves of the location of the pipeline. The permit allows them to build then the pipeline at that location that was approved.  So when you're looking, again, at 49-22.1-13, under subsection 2, 2(b) indicates "Except as provided in this section, a permit for the construction of a gas or liquid transmission facility within a designated corridor supersedes and preempts any local land use or zoning regulations."  We're getting ahead of ourselves there because we're not talking about a permit to construct the pipeline at this point. We're talking about designating that corridor or giving that site compatibility certificate to give them the location that they can build it.  So we have to look at where we're issuing a certificate, and that would be under 2(d). "When the application for a certificate for a gas or liquid
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	motion by Summit when they talked about superseding the Burleigh County ordinances. The first ordinance, which they identify as the March 6th ordinance, was a countywide ordinance adopted under the county's Home Rule Charter, and that ordinance dealt with basically sharing of information from a pipeline company to provide safety information to the county so that the county would be able to train and have first responders able to take care of any emergency that arose.  That ordinance, again, doesn't regulate the safety of the pipeline or the company, but what it does is it actually puts forth for them to share with the county an emergency action plan, an emergency response and hazard mitigation plan, and safety procedures and protocol of the pipeline company so that our first responders would have that information, our emergency management department would have that information, so if an emergency did occur, again, we would have the proper training and planning to be able to handle that emergency. That is a countywide ordinance, again, under the Home Rule Charter and would apply throughout the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	facility within the designated corridor.  So we're talking about two things. The certificate basically approves of the location of the pipeline. The permit allows them to build then the pipeline at that location that was approved.  So when you're looking, again, at 49-22.1-13, under subsection 2, 2(b) indicates "Except as provided in this section, a permit for the construction of a gas or liquid transmission facility within a designated corridor supersedes and preempts any local land use or zoning regulations."  We're getting ahead of ourselves there because we're not talking about a permit to construct the pipeline at this point. We're talking about designating that corridor or giving that site compatibility certificate to give them the location that they can build it.  So we have to look at where we're issuing a certificate, and that would be under 2(d). "When the application for a certificate for a gas or liquid transmission facility is filed, the commission shall

## December 21, 2023, Formal Hearing ND PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

cities, and counties in which part of the proposed setbacks that are imposed by the Burleigh County zoning ordinance relates to the safety of the pipeline, but 2 corridor is located." 2 3 And it's at that point that those governmental 3 that's not the case. 4 agencies are required to file, ten days before the 4 If you look at the -- especially the letter that 5 hearing, their requirements, which are their ordinances 5 was sent out by PHMSA, the Pipeline and Hazardous 6 6 or their zoning regulations. And it's at that point Materials Safety Administration, they specifically 7 that, if they don't file it within the timeline, then 7 indicate that their authority, their federal 8 those zoning regulations are superseded or preempted 8 regulations, their authority, is for the safety and 9 automatically for the certificate for site 9 construction of the pipeline. They don't deal with 10 compatibility, or the corridor in this case. 10 zoning regulations. They don't deal with setbacks. 11 11 We're not -- then when we look at subsection e, That's left up to the individual local authorities. 12 "An applicant shall comply with the local requirements 12 The only thing within the Burleigh County zoning 13 provided to the commission pursuant to subdivision d, 13 ordinance that could be -- that could maybe be construed 14 which are not otherwise superseded by the commission." 14 as being or falling within the parameters of PHMSA would 15 be on the March 30th -- or March 30th ordinance, which That seems to imply that once those regulations 15 16 or ordinances are submitted to the commission when 16 is the zoning ordinance, under section 8 subsection 5, 17 considering that corridor, then the commission can 17 where it talks about the valves and the placement of the 18 determine whether or not those -- those ordinances can 18 valves and the spacing in between those. That may fall 19 be superseded. There isn't really a guideline as to how 19 or may be deemed to fall within the parameters of PHMSA, 20 20 or when they can be superseded. but the remaining ordinance is all within the zoning 21 21 2(c) deals again where it does talk about that authority of the Burleigh County Commission. 22 22 the applicant has to show by a preponderance of the And even if this Commission would deem that that 23 23 subsection does fall within the federal regulations and evidence how the regulations and ordinances are 24 unreasonably restrictive. But, again, 2(c) is talking 24 it's incompatible with the federal regulations of PHMSA, 25 about, before the facility is approved, the commission 25 the remaining portions of the ordinance are still within 1 1 shall require the applicant to comply with the road use the zoning authority of the Burleigh County Commission 2 agreements of the impacted political subdivision. And 2 and don't need to be superseded. 3 then a permit may supersede and permit the requirements 3 Because we're talking about a site compatibility 4 of the political subdivision if the applicant shows by 4 application at this time and not a permit to build, 5 5 the preponderance of the evidence that the regulations there is no automatic superseding of the land use or 6 are unreasonably restrictive, the cost factors, and all 6 zoning regulations of the local entities until we get to 7 those other things. 7 that point. 8 Again, we're talking about the permit for 8 It's Burleigh County's position that this 9 construction there. We're not talking about site 9 Commission needs to be looking at the local ordinances 10 compatibility. 10 and the zoning ordinances and issuing a permit for site 11 In this situation, too, the county -- when we 11 compatibility or site corridor based upon those local 12 12 zoning regulations and take those into consideration adopted our zoning ordinance, that was after the 13 application was submitted to the Commission. However, 13 when deciding whether or not this site is the 14 the zoning ordinance that we have applies to all 14 appropriate site for this pipeline. 15 hazardous liquid pipelines. There's nothing specific 15 And that's my argument, unless there are any regarding carbon dioxide pipelines within that zoning 16 16 questions. 17 ordinance. So that zoning ordinance is not meant to 17 ALJ HOGAN: All right. Thank you. 18 restrict just carbon dioxide pipelines. It's all 18 Are there any questions from the commissioners 19 hazardous liquid pipelines. 19 or Mr. Dawson? 20 20 There's nothing in the first ordinance regarding Go ahead. 21 the sharing of information so that the county has those 21 COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Ms. Lawyer, the 22 22 hazard mitigation plans, the safety procedures and ordinance that I have -- I don't know which of the two 23 protocols, and the emergency action plan that actually 23 it is -- is as you referred to them. It says Ordinance 24 regulates the safety of a pipeline. 24 23-003. It was -- it was in our Docket No. 206. 25 I know that Summit has been arguing that the 25 But I thought you just said that it is not about

	ND 1 ODLIO OLIV		
1	safety, but I see safety mentioned in here several	1	MS. LAWYER: I believe it's ten miles no.
2	times. So how do you bring that together?	2	COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: That's from cities.
3	MS. LAWYER: It doesn't regulate the safety of	3	MS. LAWYER: Ten miles from transmission let
4	the pipeline. It doesn't say how they have to build the	4	me look real quick.
5	pipeline to keep it safe. It does deal with the safety	5	COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: I have it here too
6	of the community. We want to be able to respond to any	6	somewhere. Two miles.
7	emergency that happens. And so we want to know what	7	So if a resident that is opposed to this
8	their safety plan is, their protocol, so that we can	8	project, let's say they live right inside the section
9	prepare for that. That's all that that ordinance is.	9	line of one of the townships that are covered and this
10	And that's the one that's referred to by Summit	10	pipeline is proposed to be just in the next township.
11	as the March 6th ordinance. And so that would be the	11	Does that mean that your ordinance does not cover it
12	countywide ordinance under Home Rule Charter. And that	12	because the pipeline is out? Or do you cover two miles
13	is regarding the safety of the community, but just so	13	from everyone in one of your townships that your
14	that we can respond to any emergency requirements. It	14	ordinance covers?
15	doesn't require Summit to do anything with their	15	MS. LAWYER: So the ordinance would cover up to
16	pipeline or build it in any particular place. It just	16	that township line. That would be the border for it.
17	requires them to share that information with the county	17	So in a case like that where it's just over the township
18	so that we can be prepared in the event of an emergency.	18	section, it would cover the two miles that are within
19	COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Okay. And did you get	19	the township that's covered by the zoning ordinance, but
20	a chance to see the Summit the Story County judge's	20	it would only cover to the township boundary for the
21	decision that was docketed in this case a couple days	21	next township that it does not apply to.
22	ago?	22	COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: If you live near the
23	MS. LAWYER: I did, Your Honor.	23	edge of that township, you might have two miles of
24	COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Okay. And I think I	24	coverage on one side and 50 feet on the other?
25	just heard you say that PHMSA said that they don't deal	25	MS. LAWYER: Correct.
	PAGE 41		PAGE 43
1	with setbacks, but how do I merge that with the judge's	1	COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Okay. And you made a
2	statement that state authority may not adopt safety	2	filing at one point in late August that was Docket 380.
3	standards for pipeline facilities?	3	Do you happen to have that with you?
4	MS. LAWYER: The setbacks, I don't believe those	4	MS. LAWYER: I'll pull it up.
5	are safety standards for the actual facility. There are	5	COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: No. I gave you the
6	two different things we're talking about here. One is	6	wrong number. That was Emmons County's. Yours was 378.
7	how the building is built to make sure that it is safe	7	MS. LAWYER: And what was the number again? I
8	and the operation of whatever facility it is is	8	apologize.
9	operating safely. The setbacks are basically for the	9	COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: The docket number?
10	community to make sure that, if anything does happen	10	MS. LAWYER: Yes.
11	with the safety of that building, which is what PHMSA is	11	COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: 378.
12	responsible for, doesn't affect the community.	12	MS. LAWYER: Thank you.
13	COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: And then same	13	(Pause)
14	question. Because two pages later the judge said that	14	MS. LAWYER: Okay, I apologize for the delay. I
15	setbacks are unenforceable as they create dual safety	15	have that up now.
16	regulations and compete with the Secretary of	16	COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Okay. Would you go to
17	Transportation's spectrum of duties.	17	the second page please and then to paragraph 3?
		18	MS. LAWYER: Yes.
18	MS. LAWYER: That's what that judge said in that		
19	MS. LAWYER: That's what that judge said in that opinion.	19	COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: So you start out, the
19 20		20	COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: So you start out, the first little over four lines and is legal language
19 20 21	opinion.  COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Okay. Now in your ordinance specifically, one thing that I've been wanting	20 21	,
19 20 21 22	opinion.  COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Okay. Now in your ordinance specifically, one thing that I've been wanting to ask for a long time. So there's some townships that	20 21 22	first little over four lines and is legal language and you cite the section. It's subsection a. And then starting from there, the next several lines, you have
19 20 21 22 23	opinion.  COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Okay. Now in your ordinance specifically, one thing that I've been wanting to ask for a long time. So there's some townships that you said are covered and some are not. And so like on	20 21 22 23	first little over four lines and is legal language and you cite the section. It's subsection a. And then starting from there, the next several lines, you have cited as 49-22.1-01(7)(a) and it doesn't read the way my
19 20 21 22 23 24	opinion.  COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Okay. Now in your ordinance specifically, one thing that I've been wanting to ask for a long time. So there's some townships that you said are covered and some are not. And so like on the what's your setback from residences, the	20 21 22 23 24	first little over four lines and is legal language and you cite the section. It's subsection a. And then starting from there, the next several lines, you have cited as 49-22.1-01(7)(a) and it doesn't read the way my copy of that section reads.
19 20 21 22 23	opinion.  COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Okay. Now in your ordinance specifically, one thing that I've been wanting to ask for a long time. So there's some townships that you said are covered and some are not. And so like on	20 21 22 23	first little over four lines and is legal language and you cite the section. It's subsection a. And then starting from there, the next several lines, you have cited as 49-22.1-01(7)(a) and it doesn't read the way my

	ND 1 ODLIO OLIV	101	
1	should have been let's see. I put "Gas or liquid	1	show the location will produce minimal adverse impacts
2	energy conversion facility" and it should have been "Gas	2	and effects on the environment and the welfare of the
3	or liquid transmission facility."	3	citizens of North Dakota and they failed to meet their
4	COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Correct. And that was	4	burden to show the project will minimize adverse human
5	my concern. This is out there that a quote from the	5	and environmental impact.
6	law that a gas or liquid energy conversion facility	6	And since that decision they have brought
7	includes, and on the way through it. And that's an	7	forward nothing to this Commission to address those
8	error; correct?	8	issues. And that's really the first step. And that's
9	MS. LAWYER: Does not. It's transmission	9	why all of this is premature. So that's the issue
10	facility. That was an error, yes.	10	which, of course, the Commission is going to have to
11	COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: Okay. Thank you. I	11	address, is: Is the proposed pipeline reroute which
12	have no other questions.	12	they have now submitted to the Commission in a location
13	MS. LAWYER: Thank you.	13	that will produce minimal adverse impacts on the
14	ALJ HOGAN: Mr. Dawson? I can't see you way	14	environment and the welfare of the citizens?
15	down there. No questions?	15	Now we've provided to the Commission today two
16	SUBSTITUTE DECISIONMAKER DAWSON: No questions.	16	maps, and that is Exhibits 200 and 201, Warford 200 and
17	ALJ HOGAN: All right.	17	Warford 201. And Warford 200 shows the reroute that
18	MS. LAWYER: Thank you.	18	they have provided. And it's kind of interesting to
19	ALJ HOGAN: All right. Thank you, Ms. Lawyer.	19	note that all they have presented this Commission with
20	All right. The next party on my list is	20	in terms of the reroute is what's in Docket 386
21	Bismarck intervenors so Mr. Bakke.	21	submitted in September, which really provides little
22	MR. BAKKE: Thank you, Judge.	22	meaning little meaningful information to the
23	Good afternoon, Commissioners.	23	Commission about their reroute and in some respects is
24	I think Emmons County and Burleigh County's	24	inaccurate.
25	attorneys have done a good job of establishing the first	25	So if we look at the earlier version of what
	PAGE 45		PAGE 47
1	point that we raised in our arguments which is that this	1	they submitted on their original application, that's
2	request is premature. It's not timely. And I'll	2	Warford 201. And what you can see is that on the
3	explain in a moment the reasons, but I think one of the	3	eastern side of the pipeline reroute, contrary to what
4	primary reasons that Ms. Lawyer just hit on is that, to	4	Summit has been publicizing in the media and elsewhere,
5	our knowledge, there is no request for a construction	5	is they did not move that eastern route that they
6	permit by Summit at this point for a pipeline. They	6	previously requested to any extent to the east. They
7	have simply applied for a certificate of site	7	kept it in the same footprint. In fact, you'll see
8	compatibility.	8	and these are based on GIS data by Burleigh County
9	So the whole provision that they rely on in	9	showing the reroute location and also showing the
10	trying to argue to the Commission that there should be	10	original route location. In some small areas they
11	no local ordinances or requirements is not on point.	11	actually are proposing on their reroute to move the
12	They rely on subsection 2(b) only and they say which	12	pipeline closer to the city of Bismarck. That's what
13	clearly provides that it deals with, quote, "a permit	13	the GIS data shows, is that they're trying to move it.
14	for the construction," unquote. And that's not what is	14	And that's in particular in relation to Silver Ranch, is
15	before this Commission at this point. This is a request	15	the area that would be impacted.
16	at this point for a site compatibility certificate and	16	Now there's some other law that has to be read
17	nothing more. And so Mr. Braaten and Ms. Lawyer are	17	in conjunction with North Dakota Century Code 22-13.1,
18	absolutely correct that for a number of reasons those	18	and that is 49-22.1-02, which is the statement of
19	local requirements are in place and very much alive in	19	policies that also applies. And what that policy said
20	the other provisions of subsection 2 of 49-22.1-13.	20	because all these statutes have to be read together.
21	So there's a number of threshold issues before	21	What NDCC 49-22.1-02 says is "The policy of this state
22	this Commission that the Commission articulated at its	22	is to site energy conversion facilities and to route
23	August 4 decision in this case that it said Summit had	23	transmission facilities in an orderly manner compatible
24	not met. And just to briefly review, the commissioners	24	with environmental preservation and the efficient use of
25	said that Summit failed to meet its burden of proof to	25	resources. Sites and routes must be selected to

## December 21, 2023, Formal Hearing ND PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

minimize adverse human and environmental impact." 2 So regardless of the application of 49-22.1-13, 3 they would still have to meet that criteria. And so 4 until they select a route that meets that statement of 5 policy and meets that criteria, it would be premature to 6 issue a certificate. 7 The other thing -- and Ms. Lawyer talked about 8 the statute and that's the March 6th statute that they 9 -- that Burleigh County adopted and what that statute 10 dealt with -- and that is previously Warford 114. What 11 that statute dealt with was dealing with the issue of 12 providing safety procedures and protocols upon request 13 to landowners within the site boundaries and to

14

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

interested persons.

And we've marked as Exhibits Warford 202 and
Warford 203 what Summit has done since the PSC's initial
decision on August 4. You can see Exhibit 202 is dated
August 28, 2023, from Summit. And it's a draft
emergency response plan, which clearly says on it
"draft" and just contains generic information. Nothing
specific to Burleigh County at all.

specific to Burleigh County at all.
And Warford Exhibit 203 is their initial
response tactic provided to Burleigh County, and that's
blank. It's just a template with no information on it.
Where it says "Response Strategy," it doesn't even have

PAGE 49

the latitude or longitude, the location, distance from release sources. It's empty. They've done nothing to comply with that aspect which the Commission said was deficient.

Burleigh County, they're supposed to provide safety procedures and protocols upon request, not only to Burleigh County but to landowners within the site boundaries and to interested persons. That has not been done.

And if we look back at the ordinance from

And then another factor that needs to be considered here, because they talk about -- Summit talks about state statutes from Iowa and other locations, but it's important to recognize that in North Dakota, under the Century Code, North Dakota Century Code 11-33-01 gives statutory power to the counties to regulate properties.

And that's why the reading that Ms. Lawyer gave and Mr. Braaten gave, 49-22.1-13, is directly on point. Because if this was interpreted in the way that Summit says it should be interpreted, it would contradict North Dakota Century Code 11-33-01 giving statutory power to the counties to regulate properties.

24 And, in fact, there's a Supreme Court decision25 directly on point, which is the *Shaw v. Burleigh County* 

case, and the citation for that is 286 N.W.2d 792, and
 not coincidentally, it involves Burleigh County and what
 it did in that case involving a special use permit.
 And that's another thing that Summit has failed

to comply. That's why this is premature. They have the
-- they have the cart before the horse. And this is
another reason why, is because they've never applied for
a special use permit with Burleigh County. What the
special use permit says is they should apply for that

10 first, and then their first right of appeal is to this
11 commission. They've never applied for a special use
12 permit. That is the first thing they must do. And then

there's also a variance procedure available to themunder the Burleigh County ordinance.

under the Burleigh County ordinance.And that's exactly what the S.

And that's exactly what the Shaw v. Burleigh County case addressed, is a special use permit, in that case for a mobile home that someone wanted to place in a residential area, and if Burleigh County does not allow that, it's a standard of arbitrary and capricious. In other words, it has to be determined that the county's actions were not justifiable. And they haven't applied for that special use permit, and that would be step one that they would have to do.

And so the statute -- or the ordinances by Burleigh County, both the one -- both of which deal with

PAGE 51

safety and both of which deal, to some extent, with land
 use, cover both bases. They cover not only the zoning
 requirements and the land use requirements. They also
 address the public safety issues.

So let's take an example of zoning. Nobody is telling in a traditional sense to Summit "You can't put your pipeline in a certain location in Burleigh County." You know, zoning is for commercial land. What can you do in a commercial area, what can you put in a

residential area.
They can put this in many locations throughout
Burleigh County. And the current map, Exhibit 200,
shows, when you look at the white townships there, there

are many routes through different townships, both to theeast of Bismarck and to the north of Bismarck, where

16 they could go where these Burleigh County ordinances do

17 not apply. There are no ordinances, to our knowledge,

in those townships that say you can't put a pipeline, aCO2 pipeline, in a more remote location further away

19 CO2 pipeline, in a more remote location further away20 from the city of Bismarck for the safety of the

21 citizens. Burleigh County has not taken the position

that it can't go anywhere in Burleigh County. Clearly,there is a route.

So when they say there is no route in BurleighCounty, that's clearly wrong. There are only

PAGE 50

	IND PUBLIC SERV	-	
1	approximately 25 percent of the townships which are	1	pipelines will operate and is governed by state and
2	governed by or who are part of what have been adopted	2	local law."
3	under these two ordinances. So there's many locations	3	And what a federal judge says or how a judge
4	where they can go.	4	interprets what PHMSA what that judge thinks PHMSA
5	And they also claim, well, this is contrary to	5	can do does not trump or overrule what PHMSA itself has
6	state law, which they say they say the Burleigh	6	recently said.
7	County and Emmons County ordinances conflict with state	7	This letter was provided to Summit just 12 days
8	law promoting a policy of carbon sequestration. That's	8	before they filed this motion for preemption. They knew
9	false.	9	that PHMSA had said specifically that it was up to the
10	If you look at North Dakota Century Code	10	state governments, it was up to the counties, to
11	38-22-01, that statute merely makes a broad policy	11	determine where these pipeline where CO2 pipelines go
12	statement that says, quote, "It is in the public	12	and that PHMSA doesn't have jurisdiction over that issue
13	interest to promote the geological storage of carbon	13	and, in fact, said it's specifically left with the
14	dioxide." Doesn't say anything about where the	14	counties.
15	transmission lines can go. Doesn't say anything about	15	And so for all those reasons, this is premature
16	they can be put within a certain distance of a city. It	16	and what we're requesting to happen here is that the
17	doesn't say anything to suggest that the state	17	Commission proceed with an additional hearing date or
18	supercedes or preempts the county in regulating land	18	dates and determine that subsection 49-22.1-13 subpart b
19	use, as Summit is arguing. The statute says nothing	19	has no application at this point because it's a request
20	about CO2 pipelines or where they can be located. So	20	for a permit for construction, which is not before the
21	these county ordinances do not contradict state law.	21	Commission.
22	And then the other thing is the PHMSA. And,	22	So unless the commissioners have any questions
23	Commissioner Christmann, I agree with you that federal	23	for me which I'd be happy to respond to, I appreciate
24	court decision in Iowa says what it says. However, what	24	your the opportunity to speak.
25	it doesn't say is that this federal court judge in Iowa,	25	ALJ HOGAN: All right. Thank you.
	PAGE 53		PAGE 55
1	applying Iowa law, Iowa setbacks, can preempt what PHMSA	1	Are there any questions from commissioners or
1 2	applying Iowa law, Iowa setbacks, can preempt what PHMSA says on pipelines.	1 2	Are there any questions from commissioners or Mr. Dawson?
	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		
2	says on pipelines.	2	Mr. Dawson?
2	says on pipelines.  And that's why we attached Attachment A to our	2	Mr. Dawson?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do not.
2 3 4	says on pipelines.  And that's why we attached Attachment A to our brief, which is the PHMSA letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO	2 3 4	Mr. Dawson?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do not.  ALJ HOGAN: All right. Well, thank you,
2 3 4 5	says on pipelines.  And that's why we attached Attachment A to our brief, which is the PHMSA letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, dated September 15, 2023. And Mr. Braaten	2 3 4 5	Mr. Dawson?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do not.  ALJ HOGAN: All right. Well, thank you,  Mr. Bakke.
2 3 4 5 6	says on pipelines.  And that's why we attached Attachment A to our brief, which is the PHMSA letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, dated September 15, 2023. And Mr. Braaten read to you part of that. He read part of what PHMSA	2 3 4 5 6	Mr. Dawson?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do not.  ALJ HOGAN: All right. Well, thank you,  Mr. Bakke.  All right. Next on my list is the landowners
2 3 4 5 6 7	says on pipelines.  And that's why we attached Attachment A to our brief, which is the PHMSA letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, dated September 15, 2023. And Mr. Braaten read to you part of that. He read part of what PHMSA said in that regard saying that it's up to the counties	2 3 4 5 6 7	Mr. Dawson?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do not.  ALJ HOGAN: All right. Well, thank you,  Mr. Bakke.  All right. Next on my list is the landowners landowner intervenors. So, Mr. Leibel, you can go
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	says on pipelines.  And that's why we attached Attachment A to our brief, which is the PHMSA letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, dated September 15, 2023. And Mr. Braaten read to you part of that. He read part of what PHMSA said in that regard saying that it's up to the counties and the local jurisdictions and the state to determine	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Mr. Dawson?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do not.  ALJ HOGAN: All right. Well, thank you,  Mr. Bakke.  All right. Next on my list is the landowners landowner intervenors. So, Mr. Leibel, you can go ahead.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	says on pipelines.  And that's why we attached Attachment A to our brief, which is the PHMSA letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, dated September 15, 2023. And Mr. Braaten read to you part of that. He read part of what PHMSA said in that regard saying that it's up to the counties and the local jurisdictions and the state to determine where CO2 pipelines can go.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Mr. Dawson?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do not.  ALJ HOGAN: All right. Well, thank you,  Mr. Bakke.  All right. Next on my list is the landowners landowner intervenors. So, Mr. Leibel, you can go ahead.  MR. LEIBEL: May it please the Commission. I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	says on pipelines.  And that's why we attached Attachment A to our brief, which is the PHMSA letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, dated September 15, 2023. And Mr. Braaten read to you part of that. He read part of what PHMSA said in that regard saying that it's up to the counties and the local jurisdictions and the state to determine where CO2 pipelines can go.  That judge has no basis to say PHMSA can't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Mr. Dawson?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do not.  ALJ HOGAN: All right. Well, thank you,  Mr. Bakke.  All right. Next on my list is the landowners landowner intervenors. So, Mr. Leibel, you can go ahead.  MR. LEIBEL: May it please the Commission. I provided to you, each of the commissioners with copies
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	says on pipelines.  And that's why we attached Attachment A to our brief, which is the PHMSA letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, dated September 15, 2023. And Mr. Braaten read to you part of that. He read part of what PHMSA said in that regard saying that it's up to the counties and the local jurisdictions and the state to determine where CO2 pipelines can go.  That judge has no basis to say PHMSA can't decide. In fact, she did say PHMSA can decide where	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Mr. Dawson?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do not. ALJ HOGAN: All right. Well, thank you, Mr. Bakke.  All right. Next on my list is the landowners landowner intervenors. So, Mr. Leibel, you can go ahead.  MR. LEIBEL: May it please the Commission. I provided to you, each of the commissioners with copies to all the counsel, a little blue packet that includes
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	says on pipelines.  And that's why we attached Attachment A to our brief, which is the PHMSA letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, dated September 15, 2023. And Mr. Braaten read to you part of that. He read part of what PHMSA said in that regard saying that it's up to the counties and the local jurisdictions and the state to determine where CO2 pipelines can go.  That judge has no basis to say PHMSA can't decide. In fact, she did say PHMSA can decide where pipelines are to be sited. And they have said that is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Mr. Dawson?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do not.  ALJ HOGAN: All right. Well, thank you,  Mr. Bakke.  All right. Next on my list is the landowners landowner intervenors. So, Mr. Leibel, you can go ahead.  MR. LEIBEL: May it please the Commission. I provided to you, each of the commissioners with copies to all the counsel, a little blue packet that includes where I printed out the statutes that are at issue
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	says on pipelines.  And that's why we attached Attachment A to our brief, which is the PHMSA letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, dated September 15, 2023. And Mr. Braaten read to you part of that. He read part of what PHMSA said in that regard saying that it's up to the counties and the local jurisdictions and the state to determine where CO2 pipelines can go.  That judge has no basis to say PHMSA can't decide. In fact, she did say PHMSA can decide where pipelines are to be sited. And they have said that is up to the state, that is up to the county, that is up to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Mr. Dawson?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do not.  ALJ HOGAN: All right. Well, thank you,  Mr. Bakke.  All right. Next on my list is the landowners landowner intervenors. So, Mr. Leibel, you can go ahead.  MR. LEIBEL: May it please the Commission. I provided to you, each of the commissioners with copies to all the counsel, a little blue packet that includes where I printed out the statutes that are at issue because I'm a visual. That's kind of how I work.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	says on pipelines.  And that's why we attached Attachment A to our brief, which is the PHMSA letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, dated September 15, 2023. And Mr. Braaten read to you part of that. He read part of what PHMSA said in that regard saying that it's up to the counties and the local jurisdictions and the state to determine where CO2 pipelines can go.  That judge has no basis to say PHMSA can't decide. In fact, she did say PHMSA can decide where pipelines are to be sited. And they have said that is up to the state, that is up to the county, that is up to the local jurisdiction, not the Federal Government.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Mr. Dawson?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do not.  ALJ HOGAN: All right. Well, thank you,  Mr. Bakke.  All right. Next on my list is the landowners landowner intervenors. So, Mr. Leibel, you can go ahead.  MR. LEIBEL: May it please the Commission. I provided to you, each of the commissioners with copies to all the counsel, a little blue packet that includes where I printed out the statutes that are at issue because I'm a visual. That's kind of how I work.  And I would direct the Commission to the first
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	says on pipelines.  And that's why we attached Attachment A to our brief, which is the PHMSA letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, dated September 15, 2023. And Mr. Braaten read to you part of that. He read part of what PHMSA said in that regard saying that it's up to the counties and the local jurisdictions and the state to determine where CO2 pipelines can go.  That judge has no basis to say PHMSA can't decide. In fact, she did say PHMSA can decide where pipelines are to be sited. And they have said that is up to the state, that is up to the county, that is up to the local jurisdiction, not the Federal Government.  In fact, on the first page of that letter to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Mr. Dawson?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do not. ALJ HOGAN: All right. Well, thank you, Mr. Bakke. All right. Next on my list is the landowners landowner intervenors. So, Mr. Leibel, you can go ahead. MR. LEIBEL: May it please the Commission. I provided to you, each of the commissioners with copies to all the counsel, a little blue packet that includes where I printed out the statutes that are at issue because I'm a visual. That's kind of how I work. And I would direct the Commission to the first tab, which is the statute we're talking about here
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	says on pipelines.  And that's why we attached Attachment A to our brief, which is the PHMSA letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, dated September 15, 2023. And Mr. Braaten read to you part of that. He read part of what PHMSA said in that regard saying that it's up to the counties and the local jurisdictions and the state to determine where CO2 pipelines can go.  That judge has no basis to say PHMSA can't decide. In fact, she did say PHMSA can decide where pipelines are to be sited. And they have said that is up to the state, that is up to the county, that is up to the local jurisdiction, not the Federal Government.  In fact, on the first page of that letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, Mr. Mayberry, who is the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Mr. Dawson?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do not.  ALJ HOGAN: All right. Well, thank you,  Mr. Bakke.  All right. Next on my list is the landowners landowner intervenors. So, Mr. Leibel, you can go ahead.  MR. LEIBEL: May it please the Commission. I provided to you, each of the commissioners with copies to all the counsel, a little blue packet that includes where I printed out the statutes that are at issue because I'm a visual. That's kind of how I work.  And I would direct the Commission to the first tab, which is the statute we're talking about here today. And one of the things that I think that I wanted
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	says on pipelines.  And that's why we attached Attachment A to our brief, which is the PHMSA letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, dated September 15, 2023. And Mr. Braaten read to you part of that. He read part of what PHMSA said in that regard saying that it's up to the counties and the local jurisdictions and the state to determine where CO2 pipelines can go.  That judge has no basis to say PHMSA can't decide. In fact, she did say PHMSA can decide where pipelines are to be sited. And they have said that is up to the state, that is up to the county, that is up to the local jurisdiction, not the Federal Government.  In fact, on the first page of that letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, Mr. Mayberry, who is the associate administrator for safety, says, in the third	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Mr. Dawson?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do not.  ALJ HOGAN: All right. Well, thank you,  Mr. Bakke.  All right. Next on my list is the landowners landowner intervenors. So, Mr. Leibel, you can go ahead.  MR. LEIBEL: May it please the Commission. I provided to you, each of the commissioners with copies to all the counsel, a little blue packet that includes where I printed out the statutes that are at issue because I'm a visual. That's kind of how I work.  And I would direct the Commission to the first tab, which is the statute we're talking about here today. And one of the things that I think that I wanted to share with the Commission and help the Commission, at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	says on pipelines.  And that's why we attached Attachment A to our brief, which is the PHMSA letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, dated September 15, 2023. And Mr. Braaten read to you part of that. He read part of what PHMSA said in that regard saying that it's up to the counties and the local jurisdictions and the state to determine where CO2 pipelines can go.  That judge has no basis to say PHMSA can't decide. In fact, she did say PHMSA can decide where pipelines are to be sited. And they have said that is up to the state, that is up to the county, that is up to the local jurisdiction, not the Federal Government.  In fact, on the first page of that letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, Mr. Mayberry, who is the associate administrator for safety, says, in the third paragraph, "While the Federal Energy Regulatory	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Mr. Dawson?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do not.  ALJ HOGAN: All right. Well, thank you, Mr. Bakke.  All right. Next on my list is the landowners landowner intervenors. So, Mr. Leibel, you can go ahead.  MR. LEIBEL: May it please the Commission. I provided to you, each of the commissioners with copies to all the counsel, a little blue packet that includes where I printed out the statutes that are at issue because I'm a visual. That's kind of how I work.  And I would direct the Commission to the first tab, which is the statute we're talking about here today. And one of the things that I think that I wanted to share with the Commission and help the Commission, at least from my perspective, how I see this, I think
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	says on pipelines.  And that's why we attached Attachment A to our brief, which is the PHMSA letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, dated September 15, 2023. And Mr. Braaten read to you part of that. He read part of what PHMSA said in that regard saying that it's up to the counties and the local jurisdictions and the state to determine where CO2 pipelines can go.  That judge has no basis to say PHMSA can't decide. In fact, she did say PHMSA can decide where pipelines are to be sited. And they have said that is up to the state, that is up to the county, that is up to the local jurisdiction, not the Federal Government.  In fact, on the first page of that letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, Mr. Mayberry, who is the associate administrator for safety, says, in the third paragraph, "While the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has exclusive authority to regulate the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Mr. Dawson?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do not. ALJ HOGAN: All right. Well, thank you, Mr. Bakke. All right. Next on my list is the landowners landowner intervenors. So, Mr. Leibel, you can go ahead. MR. LEIBEL: May it please the Commission. I provided to you, each of the commissioners with copies to all the counsel, a little blue packet that includes where I printed out the statutes that are at issue because I'm a visual. That's kind of how I work. And I would direct the Commission to the first tab, which is the statute we're talking about here today. And one of the things that I think that I wanted to share with the Commission and help the Commission, at least from my perspective, how I see this, I think beginning with the first sentence of the statute, it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	says on pipelines.  And that's why we attached Attachment A to our brief, which is the PHMSA letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, dated September 15, 2023. And Mr. Braaten read to you part of that. He read part of what PHMSA said in that regard saying that it's up to the counties and the local jurisdictions and the state to determine where CO2 pipelines can go.  That judge has no basis to say PHMSA can't decide. In fact, she did say PHMSA can decide where pipelines are to be sited. And they have said that is up to the state, that is up to the county, that is up to the local jurisdiction, not the Federal Government.  In fact, on the first page of that letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, Mr. Mayberry, who is the associate administrator for safety, says, in the third paragraph, "While the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has exclusive authority to regulate the siting of interstate gas transmission pipelines, there	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Mr. Dawson?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do not. ALJ HOGAN: All right. Well, thank you, Mr. Bakke. All right. Next on my list is the landowners landowner intervenors. So, Mr. Leibel, you can go ahead. MR. LEIBEL: May it please the Commission. I provided to you, each of the commissioners with copies to all the counsel, a little blue packet that includes where I printed out the statutes that are at issue because I'm a visual. That's kind of how I work. And I would direct the Commission to the first tab, which is the statute we're talking about here today. And one of the things that I think that I wanted to share with the Commission and help the Commission, at least from my perspective, how I see this, I think beginning with the first sentence of the statute, it talks about "The issuance of a certificate of site
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	says on pipelines.  And that's why we attached Attachment A to our brief, which is the PHMSA letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, dated September 15, 2023. And Mr. Braaten read to you part of that. He read part of what PHMSA said in that regard saying that it's up to the counties and the local jurisdictions and the state to determine where CO2 pipelines can go.  That judge has no basis to say PHMSA can't decide. In fact, she did say PHMSA can decide where pipelines are to be sited. And they have said that is up to the state, that is up to the county, that is up to the local jurisdiction, not the Federal Government.  In fact, on the first page of that letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, Mr. Mayberry, who is the associate administrator for safety, says, in the third paragraph, "While the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has exclusive authority to regulate the siting of interstate gas transmission pipelines, there is no equivalent federal agency that determines siting	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Mr. Dawson?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do not.  ALJ HOGAN: All right. Well, thank you,  Mr. Bakke.  All right. Next on my list is the landowners landowner intervenors. So, Mr. Leibel, you can go ahead.  MR. LEIBEL: May it please the Commission. I provided to you, each of the commissioners with copies to all the counsel, a little blue packet that includes where I printed out the statutes that are at issue because I'm a visual. That's kind of how I work.  And I would direct the Commission to the first tab, which is the statute we're talking about here today. And one of the things that I think that I wanted to share with the Commission and help the Commission, at least from my perspective, how I see this, I think beginning with the first sentence of the statute, it talks about "The issuance of a certificate of site compatibility or a route permit is," and, you know, it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	says on pipelines.  And that's why we attached Attachment A to our brief, which is the PHMSA letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, dated September 15, 2023. And Mr. Braaten read to you part of that. He read part of what PHMSA said in that regard saying that it's up to the counties and the local jurisdictions and the state to determine where CO2 pipelines can go.  That judge has no basis to say PHMSA can't decide. In fact, she did say PHMSA can decide where pipelines are to be sited. And they have said that is up to the state, that is up to the county, that is up to the local jurisdiction, not the Federal Government.  In fact, on the first page of that letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, Mr. Mayberry, who is the associate administrator for safety, says, in the third paragraph, "While the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has exclusive authority to regulate the siting of interstate gas transmission pipelines, there is no equivalent federal agency that determines siting of all other pipelines, such as carbon dioxide	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Mr. Dawson?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do not. ALJ HOGAN: All right. Well, thank you, Mr. Bakke.  All right. Next on my list is the landowners landowner intervenors. So, Mr. Leibel, you can go ahead.  MR. LEIBEL: May it please the Commission. I provided to you, each of the commissioners with copies to all the counsel, a little blue packet that includes where I printed out the statutes that are at issue because I'm a visual. That's kind of how I work.  And I would direct the Commission to the first tab, which is the statute we're talking about here today. And one of the things that I think that I wanted to share with the Commission and help the Commission, at least from my perspective, how I see this, I think beginning with the first sentence of the statute, it talks about "The issuance of a certificate of site compatibility or a route permit is," and, you know, it's the sole site or route approval.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	says on pipelines.  And that's why we attached Attachment A to our brief, which is the PHMSA letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, dated September 15, 2023. And Mr. Braaten read to you part of that. He read part of what PHMSA said in that regard saying that it's up to the counties and the local jurisdictions and the state to determine where CO2 pipelines can go.  That judge has no basis to say PHMSA can't decide. In fact, she did say PHMSA can decide where pipelines are to be sited. And they have said that is up to the state, that is up to the county, that is up to the local jurisdiction, not the Federal Government.  In fact, on the first page of that letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, Mr. Mayberry, who is the associate administrator for safety, says, in the third paragraph, "While the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has exclusive authority to regulate the siting of interstate gas transmission pipelines, there is no equivalent federal agency that determines siting of all other pipelines, such as carbon dioxide pipelines. Therefore, the responsibility for siting new	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Mr. Dawson?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do not. ALJ HOGAN: All right. Well, thank you, Mr. Bakke. All right. Next on my list is the landowners landowner intervenors. So, Mr. Leibel, you can go ahead. MR. LEIBEL: May it please the Commission. I provided to you, each of the commissioners with copies to all the counsel, a little blue packet that includes where I printed out the statutes that are at issue because I'm a visual. That's kind of how I work. And I would direct the Commission to the first tab, which is the statute we're talking about here today. And one of the things that I think that I wanted to share with the Commission and help the Commission, at least from my perspective, how I see this, I think beginning with the first sentence of the statute, it talks about "The issuance of a certificate of site compatibility or a route permit is," and, you know, it's the sole site or route approval. Now, in determining what how to interpret the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	And that's why we attached Attachment A to our brief, which is the PHMSA letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, dated September 15, 2023. And Mr. Braaten read to you part of that. He read part of what PHMSA said in that regard saying that it's up to the counties and the local jurisdictions and the state to determine where CO2 pipelines can go.  That judge has no basis to say PHMSA can't decide. In fact, she did say PHMSA can decide where pipelines are to be sited. And they have said that is up to the state, that is up to the county, that is up to the local jurisdiction, not the Federal Government.  In fact, on the first page of that letter to Mr. Blank, the CEO of Summit, Mr. Mayberry, who is the associate administrator for safety, says, in the third paragraph, "While the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has exclusive authority to regulate the siting of interstate gas transmission pipelines, there is no equivalent federal agency that determines siting of all other pipelines, such as carbon dioxide pipelines. Therefore, the responsibility for siting new carbon dioxide pipelines rests largely with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Mr. Dawson?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do not. ALJ HOGAN: All right. Well, thank you, Mr. Bakke. All right. Next on my list is the landowners landowner intervenors. So, Mr. Leibel, you can go ahead. MR. LEIBEL: May it please the Commission. I provided to you, each of the commissioners with copies to all the counsel, a little blue packet that includes where I printed out the statutes that are at issue because I'm a visual. That's kind of how I work. And I would direct the Commission to the first tab, which is the statute we're talking about here today. And one of the things that I think that I wanted to share with the Commission and help the Commission, at least from my perspective, how I see this, I think beginning with the first sentence of the statute, it talks about "The issuance of a certificate of site compatibility or a route permit is," and, you know, it's the sole site or route approval. Now, in determining what how to interpret the statute, I've included under tab 2 which is another

### December 21, 2023, Formal Hearing ND PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

9

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

and it talks about how the Legislature wants their 2 statute construed. And in the second sentence from that 3 very brief statute it says "Technical words and phrases 4 and such others as have acquired a peculiar and 5 appropriate meaning in law, or as are defined by 6 statute, must be construed according to such peculiar 7 and appropriate meaning or definition." 8 And I point that out because in this case we do 9 have definitions, a definition section. Under the third 10 tab of this packet I've included a printout of 11 49-22.1-01, and that's our definitions section that 12 governs this area. 13 And as you can see, the very first entry under

the definitions section is for a "certificate." And that means a certificate of site compatibility or a certificate of corridor compatibility. Both of those words are also defined. A "corridor" means an area of land where a designated route may be established. A "site" means the location of a gas or energy conversion facility.

20 21 I also printed -- under tab 4 is a printout of 22 49-22.1-06. And this is the specific statute in North 23 Dakota that governs certificates. And, you know, the --24 if you can skip down to the very bottom of this statute,

25 No. 5, as a certificate and when a certificate is

14

15

16

17

18

19

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

PAGE 57

would say there's two things, I guess, to be specific.

2 The first is the amendments we're looking at is 3 a response to DAPL, what happened with DAPL. This is a

4 2017 statute. The other thing that the legislative

5 history is very clear about is that this is a two-step

6 process. It was envisioned to be a two-step process and

7 under the statute it's a two-step process.

8 Now the statute was also amended at this exact same time to allow parties to apply for both at the same 10 time. And so Mr. Bakke had said earlier a certificate was applied to. My understanding is it was a joint 12 application for both a certificate and a permit, but 13 this is a two-step process even if it's only

accomplished with one hearing.

And what I would point the Court -- or the Commission to is under subpart 6 is the legislative history that I previously filed with the Commission, but if you will jump to page 23 of that legislative history, there's a discussion between the energy industry's lobbyist where they are talking about this two-step process, how it works.

And about midpoint through the testimony of Mr. Kranda, which is the third paragraph from the bottom on page 23, he's talking about what he gets as a handout from the PSC. And it says "If you look at my handout is

applied for, "The commission may designate a site or 2 corridor for a proposed facility following the study and hearings provided for in this chapter."

And I'm going to skip to the very last sentence of this subpart 5. "Upon designation of a site or corridor, the commission shall issue a certificate of site compatibility." So a certificate is -- the intention is to designate a site or corridor.

If you flip to tab 5, I've printed out for you the very next statute. This is an application for a permit. And "An application for a permit for a gas or liquid transmission facility within a designated corridor --" there's the magic language from the prior statute "-- must be filed no later than two years after the issuance of the certificate."

And, you know, again, the last subpart, subpart 5, talks about a permit includes the commission designating a specific route.

19 One of the things, there's been a lot of 20 discussion of legislative history. And I share -- the 21 same warnings you've heard before is that it's difficult 22 to read too much into specific words or terms that are 23 used, but there are a couple things I think that are 24 established clearly. One of those things is that the 25 Legislature, when they were evaluating this -- and I

a certification by the PSC, deals with DAPL corridor 1 2 findings and certification letter. The certification

3 letter says, and the PSC has this for each applicant,

4 says, 'Company agrees to comply with all rules and

5 regulations of other agencies having jurisdiction.

6 including all city, township, and county zoning

7 regulations." And the lobbyist says, "So the PSC is

8 the one telling us you must comply and the locals aren't

9 losing any control. We're not trying to take away from

10 what they do and what we have to comply with."

Now, the following paragraph, the representative, Mr. Heinert, says, Well, wait a minute. "It says that they must preempt any local land use or zoning regulations. So if a local county or local city has a zoning ordinance, the pipeline is going through there, they have to change their zoning ordinance."

brings up the issue that I'm taking away from this and I 18 19 think is supported by all the statutes. It's a two-step 20 process. And he says, "Mr. Kranda, I think it would be 21 helpful, because this sub 2 is broken into two things, I 22 think it would be helpful if you broke it down into step 23 one, certificate of site capability which may not 24 supersede or preempt, and then step two, the permit for 25 construction which has to because all the other stuff

And this is the part where Chairman Porter

PAGE 58

### December 21, 2023, Formal Hearing ND PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

has been looked at during the certification process. I rules, physical addressing, dust control measures, or 2 think, so we keep it straight, what we're performing in 2 road maintenance. And my reading of that section of the 3 each of the processes, even inside of this amendment may 3 statute is that language that follows, again consistent 4 not be correct. Each of these need to be broken down 4 with this two-step process, the language that follows 5 into A, B, C." 5 modifies road use agreements. And then Mr. Kranda says, "I think that helps. 6 6 Finally, when we get to (d), this is the first 7 I didn't see that. Yeah, the first sentence, you don't 7 place we talk about a certificate, is under (d). In (a) 8 because site compatibility, the certificate for site 8 we have a certificate for a conversion facility. In (d) 9 compatibility may not supersede." 9 we talk about, finally, a certificate for a gas or 10 And I provided that so you can see it. But 10 liquid transmission facility. Under subpart (d), it's 11 11 flipping back to tab 1, which is our statute, that superseded if it's not provided within the appropriate 12 provides -- Chairman Christmann had asked a question 12 time by the local counties. And so my interpretation of 13 about not knowing how to read subpart 2(b); it didn't 13 this statute is that the certificate process requires 14 seem to make sense. They were not consistent unless you 14 the locals to have their say, at least the way this is 15 15 written. read it the way Summit had suggested. 16 And the response to that, and I'm going to skip 16 And I understand that Summit -- you know, 17 over subpart 2(a) because, you know, as the Commission 17 frankly, Summit does make a policy argument for why that 18 pointed out, that deals with a conversion facility, 18 should be expanded, but it's not in the statute, at 19 19 which is also a defined term that wouldn't include this least as I see it. The statute is very clear, once you 20 20 pipeline. But jumping to subpart b, it says "Except as -- once you accept that there are two parts to the 21 process, I don't think that you can use a permit to 21 provided in this section, a permit for the construction 22 of a gas or liquid transmission facility within a 22 preempt a certificate when a permit is expressly said 23 23 designated corridor supersedes and preempts any local it's subject to a designated corridor. And in that 24 land use or zoning regulations." 24 designated corridor, the local ordinances and rules are 25 My understanding from reading the legislative 25 part of the deal. PAGE 63 1 1 history is that one of the big concerns with DAPL, and And if anyone has any questions for me, I'd be 2 some of you may have been on the Commission at that 2 happy to answer them. time, is a permit had been issued and subsequently there 3 3 ALJ HOGAN: All right. Thank you. 4 were all kinds of problems where there was a conflict 4 Are there any questions for Mr. Leibel? 5 COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: I do not. 5 and local jurisdictions were refusing to allow this. 6 And my understanding of subpart b is that once a permit 6 COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: I do not. 7 is issued, so we already have gone through and got the 7 ALJ HOGAN: No questions. All right. Thank 8 certificate, once the permit is issued, that is the law 8 you, Mr. Leibel. 9 9 of the land. There is no more local -- the locals don't All right. Next party is Laborers Union, 10 have the ability at that time to influence or affect or 10 Mr. Pranis. 11 otherwise interfere with the authority that's been 11 MR. PRANIS: Thank you, Judge Hogan and 12 12 Commissioners. I'm a member of the Laborers Union. granted by a permit. 13 And so when I read that, that's all I see, is 13 We like to keep things simple so I'll try to 14 that's just saying that once you have a permit, you --14 keep this simple and brief. The question that we 15 any local ordinance or regulation is superseded and 15 understand is before us today is who has the authority 16 preempted. And my understanding is that's a direct 16 to decide where a pipeline can or can't be located in 17 response to what happened with DAPL. 17 the state of North Dakota. 18 18 So moving to subpart 2(c), I agree with Summit's We're not here today because we necessarily 19 attorney in evaluating this. I believe that that first 19 support Summit's project. As the commissioners are 20 sentence deals with road use agreements, which, again, 20 aware, we've expressed support for the goals but have 21 21 if you flip to your handy-dandy definition section under also expressed concerns and are still evaluating changes 22 tab 3, we have a definition for "road use agreement" and 22 that Summit has made to its application. 23 23 that road use agreement includes permits required for What we are here for today is to support the 24 extraordinary road use, road access points, approach or 24

PAGE 62

25

25

road crossings, public right of way setbacks, building

consistent application of state law and rule regarding

PAGE 64

the routing of linear infrastructure which is

### December 21, 2023, Formal Hearing ND PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

foundational for the development of the critical 2 infrastructure in North Dakota and across the country. 3 We believe the question that will be decided 4 here, hopefully today and certainly in this proceeding, 5 is more important than the question of whether to issue 6 Summit a permit to build the proposed project. In our 7 view as someone who represents workers who build this 8 kind of infrastructure, preserving the integrity of the 9 state-permitting process for linear infrastructure, 10 specifically pipelines and transmission lines, is 11 absolutely vital to maintaining reliable systems and 12 orderly development of energy resources, and we believe 13 that's why that responsibility is vested solely with the 14 Public Service Commission and not with local governments 15 in the case of linear infrastructure.

16 Our reading of the law is clear. The 17 Legislature distinguishes very clearly between 18 non-linear or point facilities such as a gas processing 19 plant and a linear facility such as a pipeline. The 20 Commission, according to the law, may not issue a 21 certificate of site compatibility or designate a site 22 that is contrary to the local rules when we're talking 23 about a fixed point facility. On the other hand, the 24 law makes clear that the Commission may issue a permit 25 that supersedes and preempts local land use and zoning

2 find routes for critical pipeline projects, right, that,

commission, with the commission in Minnesota, trying to

- 3 frankly, have turned into political footballs in many
- 4 cases because of local opposition, some of that local
- opposition that we sympathize with and understand but,
- 6 fundamentally, makes it very, very difficult to site
- 7 linear infrastructure. We believe that's why there's a
- 8 very clear difference in the law that directs the
- 9 Commission to take responsibility for this siting and
- 10 that ultimately puts local governments in an advisory 11 role.

So what does the law provide for with respect to transmission? When the law requires that or permits, rather, local governments to file their local zoning ordinances and requirements, that's an opportunity to inform the Commission, like any other facts that are part of the process, that's information that should be weighed by the Commission in designating, first, a corridor and, second, designating the final route for a route permit.

And so it is appropriate for the Commission to consider those ordinances, the reasons behind them, what those local priorities are, what those concerns are, no different than considering testimony that might be provided by local governments or letters or testimony by

regulations provided that the Commission makes a finding

2 that those regulations are unduly burdensome.

requirement is unduly restrictive.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The Legislature makes a similar distinction with respect to electric power infrastructure in almost identical language. The siting of a conversion facility such as a wind farm must conform to local land use requirements. The routing of a transmission line does not if the Commission finds the local land use

It's pretty clear here there's only two possibilities. One is that local jurisdictions have the ability to veto a proposed location and the other is that the Commission ultimately decides with input from local governments, with consideration to local concerns and to the local land use ordinances, but ultimately it's a decision by the Commission.

So why the difference? The North Dakota Code recognizes that to advance the purposes of the State, the Commission needs the clear authority to establish corridors and routes for linear infrastructure. There are many potentially suitable sites for point infrastructure like a wind farm or a gas processing plant. There are very few to get between point A and point B.

> We know this because we've spent years with this PAGE 66

1 others or other evidence in the proceeding.

2 It is evidence that does not make it binding law

3 on the Commission. And, in fact, it's clear that the --

- it's stated differently in the two different sections,
- 5 but within the pipeline statute it's simply a
- preponderance of the evidence, which is a very low
- 7 threshold. In other words, there is not a burden on the
- 8 applicant to prove beyond a reasonable doubt or beyond
- 9 any particular measure that there's a burden. All they
- 10 have to do is show that there's more evidence that it's
- unduly burdensome than not. And that's enough for the 11
- 12 Commission to decide. Effectively, this is putting it
- clearly within the Commission's purview to make that 13

14 decision.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And what does that mean in terms of protecting the concerns of local residents? It means that the Commission has to take those concerns on. And that's what the criteria that are laid out allow the Commission and instruct the Commission to do, is to consider all of those local impacts: Environmental impacts, human impacts, socioeconomic impacts, impacts on the shippers. Those are the things the Commission is asked to balance. And we would like to point out that we think the

Commission -- this Commission has a track record not only of clearly considering even the smallest local

	ND PUBLIC SERV	101	
1	concerns that are brought to them by landowners in	1	miles-long setbacks that are established, you start
2	multiple cases, in both a siting case and a routing	2	applying that and assume that every local jurisdiction
3	case, and local governments, but actively, you know,	3	should at least be allowed to implement equally rigorous
4	being willing to require to encourage applicants to	4	requirements, and there's nowhere left to site a
5	address those issues.	5	pipeline. And then we end up in a place where siting's
6	And, finally, the Commission has not been a	6	a political football.
7	rubber stamp on infrastructure. While most projects are	7	I live and work primarily in Minnesota. We have
8	eventually approved because the applicants do the things	8	a nightmare process of trying to get one single pipeline
9	needed to conform, right, not every project is approved.	9	through even with state permitting. We're seeing these
10	And so we think the Commission has not only the	10	sorts of policies being weaponized all over the country
11	authority but has shown that it has the interest of	11	in order to prevent development of critical
12	local of local residents at heart and is the best way	12	infrastructure.
13	to do this.	13	And so we have confidence in the North Dakota
14	The concern that we have, if we go a different	14	Commission to take local concerns seriously. We think
15	direction I actually think that the map that	15	that it's not clear how you put the sort of like how
16	Mr. Bakke provides, W201, is a great example of the	16	you put the worms back in the can if we're going to
17	slippery slope that we go down when we move from a	17	allow any jurisdiction to set, you know, extremely broad
18	state-based permitting system to allowing local	18	policies and then force companies to try to work around
19	governments to effectively veto routing for not only	19	or risk having their pipeline route invalidated at the
20	pipelines but potentially transmission lines because	20	end.
21	it's not clear what the legal distinction would be in a	21	Thank you for your time.
22	transmission line case.	22	ALJ HOGAN: All right. Thank you, Mr. Pranis.
23	Now if we look at the map here, there's one	23	Any questions from commissioners or Mr. Dawson?
24	potential path that's not that's marked in white	24	COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: None.
25	through Trygg Township. Now if Trygg were to implement	25	COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: I have a question
	PAGE 69		PAGE 71
	and the control of a control of the control of the control of the control of	1	in at fau alaufiaatiaa
1	were to suddenly adopt prior to the next hearing		just for clarification.
2	their own ordinance similar to the Burleigh County	2	When you were giving the scenario about the
	-	2 3	When you were giving the scenario about the counties, like Trygg County, the map you referred to
2 3 4	their own ordinance similar to the Burleigh County ordinance, it's possible that there would be no pathway anymore through Burleigh County, right. If we accept	2 3 4	When you were giving the scenario about the counties, like Trygg County, the map you referred to MR. PRANIS: The township?
2 3 4 5	their own ordinance similar to the Burleigh County ordinance, it's possible that there would be no pathway anymore through Burleigh County, right. If we accept the idea that each township and each county should be	2 3 4 5	When you were giving the scenario about the counties, like Trygg County, the map you referred to MR. PRANIS: The township? COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: Yep.
2 3 4	their own ordinance similar to the Burleigh County ordinance, it's possible that there would be no pathway anymore through Burleigh County, right. If we accept the idea that each township and each county should be able to establish any of its own ordinances at any time	2 3 4 5 6	When you were giving the scenario about the counties, like Trygg County, the map you referred to MR. PRANIS: The township?  COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: Yep.  all of a sudden doing an ordinance and then
2 3 4 5 6 7	their own ordinance similar to the Burleigh County ordinance, it's possible that there would be no pathway anymore through Burleigh County, right. If we accept the idea that each township and each county should be able to establish any of its own ordinances at any time within ten days prior to the hearing, then effectively	2 3 4 5 6 7	When you were giving the scenario about the counties, like Trygg County, the map you referred to MR. PRANIS: The township?  COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: Yep.  all of a sudden doing an ordinance and then they would be prohibited, wasn't Burleigh County or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	their own ordinance similar to the Burleigh County ordinance, it's possible that there would be no pathway anymore through Burleigh County, right. If we accept the idea that each township and each county should be able to establish any of its own ordinances at any time within ten days prior to the hearing, then effectively we've created something where it's impossible to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	When you were giving the scenario about the counties, like Trygg County, the map you referred to MR. PRANIS: The township? COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: Yep all of a sudden doing an ordinance and then they would be prohibited, wasn't Burleigh County or Emmons County saying that the company can go before them
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	their own ordinance similar to the Burleigh County ordinance, it's possible that there would be no pathway anymore through Burleigh County, right. If we accept the idea that each township and each county should be able to establish any of its own ordinances at any time within ten days prior to the hearing, then effectively we've created something where it's impossible to engineer any route with any certainty that that route	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	When you were giving the scenario about the counties, like Trygg County, the map you referred to MR. PRANIS: The township? COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: Yep all of a sudden doing an ordinance and then they would be prohibited, wasn't Burleigh County or Emmons County saying that the company can go before them and ask for a waiver? So what's prohibiting the company
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	their own ordinance similar to the Burleigh County ordinance, it's possible that there would be no pathway anymore through Burleigh County, right. If we accept the idea that each township and each county should be able to establish any of its own ordinances at any time within ten days prior to the hearing, then effectively we've created something where it's impossible to engineer any route with any certainty that that route can get through. So now we're looking at we're going	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	When you were giving the scenario about the counties, like Trygg County, the map you referred to MR. PRANIS: The township? COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: Yep all of a sudden doing an ordinance and then they would be prohibited, wasn't Burleigh County or Emmons County saying that the company can go before them and ask for a waiver? So what's prohibiting the company to go before and ask for it?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	their own ordinance similar to the Burleigh County ordinance, it's possible that there would be no pathway anymore through Burleigh County, right. If we accept the idea that each township and each county should be able to establish any of its own ordinances at any time within ten days prior to the hearing, then effectively we've created something where it's impossible to engineer any route with any certainty that that route can get through. So now we're looking at we're going into Kidder County because we can't get through Burleigh	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	When you were giving the scenario about the counties, like Trygg County, the map you referred to MR. PRANIS: The township? COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: Yep all of a sudden doing an ordinance and then they would be prohibited, wasn't Burleigh County or Emmons County saying that the company can go before them and ask for a waiver? So what's prohibiting the company to go before and ask for it? I mean, I think it I understand your intent.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	their own ordinance similar to the Burleigh County ordinance, it's possible that there would be no pathway anymore through Burleigh County, right. If we accept the idea that each township and each county should be able to establish any of its own ordinances at any time within ten days prior to the hearing, then effectively we've created something where it's impossible to engineer any route with any certainty that that route can get through. So now we're looking at we're going into Kidder County because we can't get through Burleigh County potentially.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	When you were giving the scenario about the counties, like Trygg County, the map you referred to MR. PRANIS: The township? COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: Yep all of a sudden doing an ordinance and then they would be prohibited, wasn't Burleigh County or Emmons County saying that the company can go before them and ask for a waiver? So what's prohibiting the company to go before and ask for it?  I mean, I think it I understand your intent. I absolutely do. We want to make this simple. And I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	their own ordinance similar to the Burleigh County ordinance, it's possible that there would be no pathway anymore through Burleigh County, right. If we accept the idea that each township and each county should be able to establish any of its own ordinances at any time within ten days prior to the hearing, then effectively we've created something where it's impossible to engineer any route with any certainty that that route can get through. So now we're looking at we're going into Kidder County because we can't get through Burleigh County potentially.  And so I think when we're thinking about what's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	When you were giving the scenario about the counties, like Trygg County, the map you referred to MR. PRANIS: The township? COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: Yep all of a sudden doing an ordinance and then they would be prohibited, wasn't Burleigh County or Emmons County saying that the company can go before them and ask for a waiver? So what's prohibiting the company to go before and ask for it?  I mean, I think it I understand your intent. I absolutely do. We want to make this simple. And I thank you for the compliments on the Commission in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	their own ordinance similar to the Burleigh County ordinance, it's possible that there would be no pathway anymore through Burleigh County, right. If we accept the idea that each township and each county should be able to establish any of its own ordinances at any time within ten days prior to the hearing, then effectively we've created something where it's impossible to engineer any route with any certainty that that route can get through. So now we're looking at we're going into Kidder County because we can't get through Burleigh County potentially.  And so I think when we're thinking about what's unduly what's unduly burdensome, we believe that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	When you were giving the scenario about the counties, like Trygg County, the map you referred to MR. PRANIS: The township? COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: Yep all of a sudden doing an ordinance and then they would be prohibited, wasn't Burleigh County or Emmons County saying that the company can go before them and ask for a waiver? So what's prohibiting the company to go before and ask for it?  I mean, I think it I understand your intent. I absolutely do. We want to make this simple. And I thank you for the compliments on the Commission in listening to it. But explain yourself a little bit more
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	their own ordinance similar to the Burleigh County ordinance, it's possible that there would be no pathway anymore through Burleigh County, right. If we accept the idea that each township and each county should be able to establish any of its own ordinances at any time within ten days prior to the hearing, then effectively we've created something where it's impossible to engineer any route with any certainty that that route can get through. So now we're looking at we're going into Kidder County because we can't get through Burleigh County potentially.  And so I think when we're thinking about what's unduly what's unduly burdensome, we believe that the evidence already in the record shows it's unduly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	When you were giving the scenario about the counties, like Trygg County, the map you referred to MR. PRANIS: The township? COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: Yep all of a sudden doing an ordinance and then they would be prohibited, wasn't Burleigh County or Emmons County saying that the company can go before them and ask for a waiver? So what's prohibiting the company to go before and ask for it?  I mean, I think it I understand your intent. I absolutely do. We want to make this simple. And I thank you for the compliments on the Commission in listening to it. But explain yourself a little bit more on why that would be burdensome if we want some
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	their own ordinance similar to the Burleigh County ordinance, it's possible that there would be no pathway anymore through Burleigh County, right. If we accept the idea that each township and each county should be able to establish any of its own ordinances at any time within ten days prior to the hearing, then effectively we've created something where it's impossible to engineer any route with any certainty that that route can get through. So now we're looking at we're going into Kidder County because we can't get through Burleigh County potentially.  And so I think when we're thinking about what's unduly what's unduly burdensome, we believe that the evidence already in the record shows it's unduly burdensome and that the test is, if this same policy	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	When you were giving the scenario about the counties, like Trygg County, the map you referred to MR. PRANIS: The township? COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: Yep all of a sudden doing an ordinance and then they would be prohibited, wasn't Burleigh County or Emmons County saying that the company can go before them and ask for a waiver? So what's prohibiting the company to go before and ask for it?  I mean, I think it I understand your intent. I absolutely do. We want to make this simple. And I thank you for the compliments on the Commission in listening to it. But explain yourself a little bit more on why that would be burdensome if we want some collaboration.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	their own ordinance similar to the Burleigh County ordinance, it's possible that there would be no pathway anymore through Burleigh County, right. If we accept the idea that each township and each county should be able to establish any of its own ordinances at any time within ten days prior to the hearing, then effectively we've created something where it's impossible to engineer any route with any certainty that that route can get through. So now we're looking at we're going into Kidder County because we can't get through Burleigh County potentially.  And so I think when we're thinking about what's unduly what's unduly burdensome, we believe that the evidence already in the record shows it's unduly burdensome and that the test is, if this same policy were applied to each jurisdiction, would it be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	When you were giving the scenario about the counties, like Trygg County, the map you referred to MR. PRANIS: The township? COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: Yep all of a sudden doing an ordinance and then they would be prohibited, wasn't Burleigh County or Emmons County saying that the company can go before them and ask for a waiver? So what's prohibiting the company to go before and ask for it?  I mean, I think it I understand your intent. I absolutely do. We want to make this simple. And I thank you for the compliments on the Commission in listening to it. But explain yourself a little bit more on why that would be burdensome if we want some collaboration.  MR. PRANIS: Thank you, Commissioner.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	their own ordinance similar to the Burleigh County ordinance, it's possible that there would be no pathway anymore through Burleigh County, right. If we accept the idea that each township and each county should be able to establish any of its own ordinances at any time within ten days prior to the hearing, then effectively we've created something where it's impossible to engineer any route with any certainty that that route can get through. So now we're looking at we're going into Kidder County because we can't get through Burleigh County potentially.  And so I think when we're thinking about what's unduly what's unduly burdensome, we believe that the evidence already in the record shows it's unduly burdensome and that the test is, if this same policy were applied to each jurisdiction, would it be reasonable to site a pipeline? Because it's not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	When you were giving the scenario about the counties, like Trygg County, the map you referred to MR. PRANIS: The township? COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: Yep all of a sudden doing an ordinance and then they would be prohibited, wasn't Burleigh County or Emmons County saying that the company can go before them and ask for a waiver? So what's prohibiting the company to go before and ask for it?  I mean, I think it I understand your intent. I absolutely do. We want to make this simple. And I thank you for the compliments on the Commission in listening to it. But explain yourself a little bit more on why that would be burdensome if we want some collaboration.  MR. PRANIS: Thank you, Commissioner. I think the concern our concern is twofold.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	their own ordinance similar to the Burleigh County ordinance, it's possible that there would be no pathway anymore through Burleigh County, right. If we accept the idea that each township and each county should be able to establish any of its own ordinances at any time within ten days prior to the hearing, then effectively we've created something where it's impossible to engineer any route with any certainty that that route can get through. So now we're looking at we're going into Kidder County because we can't get through Burleigh County potentially.  And so I think when we're thinking about what's unduly what's unduly burdensome, we believe that the evidence already in the record shows it's unduly burdensome and that the test is, if this same policy were applied to each jurisdiction, would it be reasonable to site a pipeline? Because it's not reasonable to say that Burleigh County should be allowed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	When you were giving the scenario about the counties, like Trygg County, the map you referred to MR. PRANIS: The township? COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: Yep all of a sudden doing an ordinance and then they would be prohibited, wasn't Burleigh County or Emmons County saying that the company can go before them and ask for a waiver? So what's prohibiting the company to go before and ask for it?  I mean, I think it I understand your intent. I absolutely do. We want to make this simple. And I thank you for the compliments on the Commission in listening to it. But explain yourself a little bit more on why that would be burdensome if we want some collaboration.  MR. PRANIS: Thank you, Commissioner. I think the concern our concern is twofold. One, it's fairly clear that in this case these
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	their own ordinance similar to the Burleigh County ordinance, it's possible that there would be no pathway anymore through Burleigh County, right. If we accept the idea that each township and each county should be able to establish any of its own ordinances at any time within ten days prior to the hearing, then effectively we've created something where it's impossible to engineer any route with any certainty that that route can get through. So now we're looking at we're going into Kidder County because we can't get through Burleigh County potentially.  And so I think when we're thinking about what's unduly what's unduly burdensome, we believe that the evidence already in the record shows it's unduly burdensome and that the test is, if this same policy were applied to each jurisdiction, would it be reasonable to site a pipeline? Because it's not reasonable to say that Burleigh County should be allowed to have extremely restrictive policies and Emmons	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	When you were giving the scenario about the counties, like Trygg County, the map you referred to MR. PRANIS: The township? COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: Yep all of a sudden doing an ordinance and then they would be prohibited, wasn't Burleigh County or Emmons County saying that the company can go before them and ask for a waiver? So what's prohibiting the company to go before and ask for it?  I mean, I think it I understand your intent. I absolutely do. We want to make this simple. And I thank you for the compliments on the Commission in listening to it. But explain yourself a little bit more on why that would be burdensome if we want some collaboration.  MR. PRANIS: Thank you, Commissioner. I think the concern our concern is twofold. One, it's fairly clear that in this case these ordinances were established as poison pills; in other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	their own ordinance similar to the Burleigh County ordinance, it's possible that there would be no pathway anymore through Burleigh County, right. If we accept the idea that each township and each county should be able to establish any of its own ordinances at any time within ten days prior to the hearing, then effectively we've created something where it's impossible to engineer any route with any certainty that that route can get through. So now we're looking at we're going into Kidder County because we can't get through Burleigh County potentially.  And so I think when we're thinking about what's unduly what's unduly burdensome, we believe that the evidence already in the record shows it's unduly burdensome and that the test is, if this same policy were applied to each jurisdiction, would it be reasonable to site a pipeline? Because it's not reasonable to say that Burleigh County should be allowed to have extremely restrictive policies and Emmons County, but the county next door isn't allowed to have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	When you were giving the scenario about the counties, like Trygg County, the map you referred to MR. PRANIS: The township? COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: Yep all of a sudden doing an ordinance and then they would be prohibited, wasn't Burleigh County or Emmons County saying that the company can go before them and ask for a waiver? So what's prohibiting the company to go before and ask for it?  I mean, I think it I understand your intent. I absolutely do. We want to make this simple. And I thank you for the compliments on the Commission in listening to it. But explain yourself a little bit more on why that would be burdensome if we want some collaboration.  MR. PRANIS: Thank you, Commissioner. I think the concern our concern is twofold. One, it's fairly clear that in this case these ordinances were established as poison pills; in other words, the timing of the ordinances and the extreme
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	their own ordinance similar to the Burleigh County ordinance, it's possible that there would be no pathway anymore through Burleigh County, right. If we accept the idea that each township and each county should be able to establish any of its own ordinances at any time within ten days prior to the hearing, then effectively we've created something where it's impossible to engineer any route with any certainty that that route can get through. So now we're looking at we're going into Kidder County because we can't get through Burleigh County potentially.  And so I think when we're thinking about what's unduly what's unduly burdensome, we believe that the evidence already in the record shows it's unduly burdensome and that the test is, if this same policy were applied to each jurisdiction, would it be reasonable to site a pipeline? Because it's not reasonable to say that Burleigh County should be allowed to have extremely restrictive policies and Emmons County, but the county next door isn't allowed to have similarly restrictive policies or that those individual	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	When you were giving the scenario about the counties, like Trygg County, the map you referred to MR. PRANIS: The township? COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: Yep all of a sudden doing an ordinance and then they would be prohibited, wasn't Burleigh County or Emmons County saying that the company can go before them and ask for a waiver? So what's prohibiting the company to go before and ask for it?  I mean, I think it I understand your intent. I absolutely do. We want to make this simple. And I thank you for the compliments on the Commission in listening to it. But explain yourself a little bit more on why that would be burdensome if we want some collaboration.  MR. PRANIS: Thank you, Commissioner. I think the concern our concern is twofold. One, it's fairly clear that in this case these ordinances were established as poison pills; in other words, the timing of the ordinances and the extreme setbacks. And I think if you look at the changes to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	their own ordinance similar to the Burleigh County ordinance, it's possible that there would be no pathway anymore through Burleigh County, right. If we accept the idea that each township and each county should be able to establish any of its own ordinances at any time within ten days prior to the hearing, then effectively we've created something where it's impossible to engineer any route with any certainty that that route can get through. So now we're looking at we're going into Kidder County because we can't get through Burleigh County potentially.  And so I think when we're thinking about what's unduly what's unduly burdensome, we believe that the evidence already in the record shows it's unduly burdensome and that the test is, if this same policy were applied to each jurisdiction, would it be reasonable to site a pipeline? Because it's not reasonable to say that Burleigh County should be allowed to have extremely restrictive policies and Emmons County, but the county next door isn't allowed to have similarly restrictive policies or that those individual townships that set their own rules, or cities, can have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	When you were giving the scenario about the counties, like Trygg County, the map you referred to MR. PRANIS: The township? COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: Yep all of a sudden doing an ordinance and then they would be prohibited, wasn't Burleigh County or Emmons County saying that the company can go before them and ask for a waiver? So what's prohibiting the company to go before and ask for it?  I mean, I think it I understand your intent. I absolutely do. We want to make this simple. And I thank you for the compliments on the Commission in listening to it. But explain yourself a little bit more on why that would be burdensome if we want some collaboration.  MR. PRANIS: Thank you, Commissioner. I think the concern our concern is twofold. One, it's fairly clear that in this case these ordinances were established as poison pills; in other words, the timing of the ordinances and the extreme setbacks. And I think if you look at the changes to Emmons County, it's fairly clear that it went from a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	their own ordinance similar to the Burleigh County ordinance, it's possible that there would be no pathway anymore through Burleigh County, right. If we accept the idea that each township and each county should be able to establish any of its own ordinances at any time within ten days prior to the hearing, then effectively we've created something where it's impossible to engineer any route with any certainty that that route can get through. So now we're looking at we're going into Kidder County because we can't get through Burleigh County potentially.  And so I think when we're thinking about what's unduly what's unduly burdensome, we believe that the evidence already in the record shows it's unduly burdensome and that the test is, if this same policy were applied to each jurisdiction, would it be reasonable to site a pipeline? Because it's not reasonable to say that Burleigh County should be allowed to have extremely restrictive policies and Emmons County, but the county next door isn't allowed to have similarly restrictive policies or that those individual townships that set their own rules, or cities, can have those same restrictive policies.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	When you were giving the scenario about the counties, like Trygg County, the map you referred to MR. PRANIS: The township? COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: Yep all of a sudden doing an ordinance and then they would be prohibited, wasn't Burleigh County or Emmons County saying that the company can go before them and ask for a waiver? So what's prohibiting the company to go before and ask for it?  I mean, I think it I understand your intent. I absolutely do. We want to make this simple. And I thank you for the compliments on the Commission in listening to it. But explain yourself a little bit more on why that would be burdensome if we want some collaboration.  MR. PRANIS: Thank you, Commissioner. I think the concern our concern is twofold. One, it's fairly clear that in this case these ordinances were established as poison pills; in other words, the timing of the ordinances and the extreme setbacks. And I think if you look at the changes to Emmons County, it's fairly clear that it went from a pretty flexible and permissive policy for looking at all
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	their own ordinance similar to the Burleigh County ordinance, it's possible that there would be no pathway anymore through Burleigh County, right. If we accept the idea that each township and each county should be able to establish any of its own ordinances at any time within ten days prior to the hearing, then effectively we've created something where it's impossible to engineer any route with any certainty that that route can get through. So now we're looking at we're going into Kidder County because we can't get through Burleigh County potentially.  And so I think when we're thinking about what's unduly what's unduly burdensome, we believe that the evidence already in the record shows it's unduly burdensome and that the test is, if this same policy were applied to each jurisdiction, would it be reasonable to site a pipeline? Because it's not reasonable to say that Burleigh County should be allowed to have extremely restrictive policies and Emmons County, but the county next door isn't allowed to have similarly restrictive policies or that those individual townships that set their own rules, or cities, can have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	When you were giving the scenario about the counties, like Trygg County, the map you referred to MR. PRANIS: The township? COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: Yep all of a sudden doing an ordinance and then they would be prohibited, wasn't Burleigh County or Emmons County saying that the company can go before them and ask for a waiver? So what's prohibiting the company to go before and ask for it?  I mean, I think it I understand your intent. I absolutely do. We want to make this simple. And I thank you for the compliments on the Commission in listening to it. But explain yourself a little bit more on why that would be burdensome if we want some collaboration.  MR. PRANIS: Thank you, Commissioner. I think the concern our concern is twofold. One, it's fairly clear that in this case these ordinances were established as poison pills; in other words, the timing of the ordinances and the extreme setbacks. And I think if you look at the changes to Emmons County, it's fairly clear that it went from a

## December 21, 2023, Formal Hearing ND PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

policy that would make it very difficult to site it's covering a broad spectrum of things, that broad 2 2 spectrum would include road use agreements. 3 And it is certainly possible that the company 3 So there are some issues with that statutory 4 would be able to obtain a waiver. I think our big 4 interpretation that just don't work well with the actual 5 concern is that is the kind of thing that chills 5 language and structure of the statute. 6 6 development. Because when any developer looks at this Emmons County raised the issue of, well, then 7 and says, "I think I can build this project, I have to 7 why would we be required to submit the ordinances? You 8 8 know, doesn't that provision get rendered superfluous if get all of these easements, I have to deal with all of 9 these environmental considerations and a route that is 9 preemption is automatic? Chair Christmann noted, "Well, 10 appropriate and that the Commission will find 10 you know, it says 'road use agreements.' Maybe you give 11 11 appropriate," if -- if you then say, "Look, I can go and them to us so we look for road use agreements." 12 12 Obviously, that's logical, but there are other secure all these easements, but at any time before the 13 hearing any local jurisdiction could, out of nowhere, 13 reasons too, right. Seeing what those concerns were 14 propose a new policy that they might or might not waive 14 that are embodied in local regulations may spur certain 15 for us," I think it makes it incredibly difficult to 15 questions that the Commission has in making its own 16 16 determinations that it has to make on the ultimate 17 And to some degree if -- if basically the only 17 decision. And sometimes, frankly, it's just good to 18 way the policy works is if the company has to be granted 18 know what's out there that the law regarding the 19 19 a waiver, then it doesn't mean much to begin with. Then Commission is, in fact, preempting. 20 20 I think you've effectively preempted anyway. And while it may sound to some like that is not 21 21 So I think it's better for the public to know enough left to be reasonable, I will tell you, and I 22 22 that they need to go to the Commission and that the hate to keep bringing Iowa up, but in the Iowa 23 23 Commission is who they need to -- who needs to hear from generating certificate statute, it basically does the 24 them rather than believing they could go to a local 24 exact same thing. Counties come forward -- and actually jurisdiction that has authority. 25 25 in that case even the applicant has to discuss here are PAGE 73 PAGE 75 1 COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: Thank you. 1 the local ordinances. And the statute is absolutely 2 ALJ HOGAN: All right. Thank you, Mr. Pranis. 2 crystal clear that once the generating certificate is 3 All right. I will return to you, Mr. Dublinske. 3 issued by the state board, that all of those local 4 Would you like to make a reply argument? ordinances are expressly preempted, that those counties 5 MR. DUBLINSKE: I would, Your Honor, and I will 5 and cities have to come to the board, participate in 6 try and do this in order and try not to repeat some of that process, and that is their opportunity. But it's 7 the arguments that obviously came up from multiple 7 still information that the utilities would want. 8 intervenors and try not to repeat Mr. Pranis either and, 8 So I don't think it's at all unreasonable or 9 hopefully, can get through this promptly. 9 even unusual, knowing that there are other states that 10 10 I would respond to Emmons County's argument by do the same thing, for your legislation to be structured 11 11 noting that while they talk about the unique ordinance the same way. 12 12 having been in place since 1980, notably, they really I'm glad that Emmons County brought up the PHMSA 13 try to sweep under the rug and not even directly answer 13 letter. I had neglected to address that. But I would 14 14 a question about the change from 200 feet to 8,000 feet encourage you to read that very closely. PHMSA clearly 15 for residences, which I think is telling for some of the 15 is trying to be as political as possible and offend 16 reasons that Mr. Pranis just discussed. 16 absolutely nobody, but Summit actually believes that 17 The statutory interpretation argument that 17 letter is supportive of our position. It is extremely 18 Emmons County advanced essentially is that paragraph (c) 18 similar, almost verbatim, to a letter that was written 19 does all the heavy lifting. And as we mentioned in our 19 to TC Energy that was in front of the federal court 20 initial argument, that renders paragraph (b) largely 20 judge in Iowa when she made her decision. 21 21 superfluous. At that point, there's no reason why they And, notably, it says repeatedly that, look, 22 22 would be separate paragraphs if (b) simply says, you PHMSA still has sole authority over safety and still has 23 23 know, find everything you need to know about how this -- and states and counties still can't conflict with 24 24 works in (c). That also ignores sort of this unique use federal law, but this part that the intervenors hang their hats on about, well, local governments have 25 of the term "road use agreements" in (c). If, indeed, PAGE 74 PAGE 76

## December 21, 2023, Formal Hearing ND PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

traditionally exercised broad powers to regulate land ahead to the Bismarck landowners, the suggestion that 2 use, and it goes on to say including setback distances 2 we've only requested a certificate and not a route 3 and property development in the vicinity of pipelines. 3 permit is just simply incorrect. If you look at the 4 It doesn't say anything about counties having 4 introduction to Docket No. 1, it very clearly says that 5 traditional authority to regulate land use for 5 we are applying for both in a combined hearing as 6 6 permitted by Section 1-08. pipelines. It says in the vicinity of pipelines. 7 7 And it talks about the county also having a role But I think, you know, if you go back and look 8 in protecting safety and how everyone from individuals 8 at 1-06, which is what has to go on an application for a 9 all the way up has a role. And it gives a list of 9 certificate, 1-07, application for a permit, 1-09, 10 10 things that it recognizes local governments have done. criteria that the Commission is to look at for a 11 11 And if you look at that list, none of them involve certificate, those lists are extensive. And it's 12 regulating pipelines. All of them involve regulating 12 telling that nowhere in those extensive lists does it 13 potential encroachments or potential damages to 13 list county ordinances as being relevant, does it 14 pipelines. 14 mention anything in either direction about preemption. 15 Finally, and this is an issue that I know 15 So the only time you find out about the 16 Commissioner Haugen-Hoffart just talked about with 16 preemptive power or not of a certificate and/or a permit 17 Mr. Pranis, but want to briefly reiterate Summit 17 is in 1-13. And for (a) it says on a conversion 18 believes that waivers and variances can't be the answer, 18 facility a certificate doesn't preempt and for (b) it 19 that a system that relies on additional waivers and 19 says on a transmission facility a permit does. And 20 20 variances is inherently unreasonably restrictive. There there is literally nothing anywhere that prohibits a 21 is no way you can plan a long lead time, long-planning 21 certificate from preempting in any other situation. 22 project based on a series of waivers and variances. 22 There's nothing in 1-06, nothing in 1-09. That all 23 23 comes strictly from 1-13, which we obviously analyzed at Regulatory law has to be knowable and 24 predictable and stable, and we need to be able to go 24 length. 25 when we start a project and look at what the law is. 25 You know, I would follow up on Chair PAGE 79 And if what we're being told is "Well, you can't rely on 1 1 Christmann's questions about so you could have a route 2 what we're putting out there in writing, just come ask 2 where you have two miles clearance on one side and 3 us for a variance, ask us for a waiver" -- and by the 3 50 feet on the other. The answer to that, I think, 4 way, because there's exceptions from ordinances, they shows just how arbitrary some of these restrictions 5 5 are inherently more stringent and harder to get than actually are. 6 just your run-of-the-mill permit under the ordinance. 6 The Bismarck landowners, I've talked a little 7 So we have a real concern about that being the alleged 7 bit about the combined application, but the prematurity 8 solution. 8 argument I have to admit I just don't understand. The 9 9 Burleigh County, I think, fundamentally sees notion that a motion to preempt county processes is 10 10 safety as much narrower than the federal courts and premature until we've already gone through those county 11 Federal Government. The comment was made, well, it 11 processes seems fundamentally flawed. 12 regulates the safety of the community, not the safety of 12 And while it may be true that there's a general 13 the pipeline. 13 allowance in the Century Code for county control of land 14 14 use, the general rule of statutory construction is that And I would suggest that PHMSA and federal 15 caselaw clearly suggest that federal law is intended to 15 the newer and more specific prevails. Obviously, 16 do both. The Kinley court case at the Eighth Circuit, 16 pipeline regulation is a specific carveout for this 17 which I believe is cited in our materials and certainly 17 Commission and the amendments to the relevant statute 18 cited in the Judge Rose decision, broadly looks at 18 are quite specific and quite recent. 19 preemption and safety. And there it was a financial 19 With regard to --20 20 security, not a specific safety standard. And the court ALJ HOGAN: I'll just note, Mr. Dublinske, 21 says we see this simply as a proxy for safety and found 21 you're almost at ten minutes. 22 22 that it was preempted. MR. DUBLINSKE: All right. Let me just make 23 23 The certificate of compatibility issue has come sure there's nothing else in here.

PAGE 78

24

25

Yeah, just -- the only other thing I wanted to

PAGE 80

point out is that the argument that the Leibel

24

25

up a couple of times, and let me just sort of address

that quickly here. First of all, and I want to jump

	ND 1 ODLIO OLIV	
1	intervenors made that section (b) somehow applies	CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPTIONIST
2	post-granting of the permit and section (c) or paragraph	
3	(c) applies to the preceding seems an unnatural reading,	STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA ) ss.
4	to sort of flip the time order around. (C) appears, a	
5	better reading, to be a specialized subset of (b).	I, Lisa A. Hulm, CET-783, a certified
6	Your Honor, the most natural reading here is	electronic transcriber, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the electronic
7	Summit's reading. The reading that best supports state	sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter, to the best of my professional
8	public policy is Summit's reading. This is a legal	skills and abilities. I further state that I was not present during these recorded proceedings, and I am
9	issue. The Commission can and should address it here	only the transcriber of the recorded proceedings.
10	and now at the outset of the reconsideration. And we	I further certify that I am not a relative
11	would ask you to preempt the unreasonably restrictive	or employee or attorney or counsel of any of the parties hereto, nor a relative or employee of such
12	ordinances of Emmons and Burleigh County.	attorney or counsel; nor do I have any interest in the outcome or events of the action.
13	Thank you.	Dated this date of October 13, 2025.
14	ALJ HOGAN: Thank you.	
15	Are there any other questions from commissioners	
16	or Mr. Dawson for Mr. Dublinske?	
17	COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: I do not.	LISA A. HULM, CET-783
18	COMMISSIONER HAUGEN-HOFFART: I do not.	
19	SUBSTITUTE DECISIONMAKER DAWSON: No.	
20	ALJ HOGAN: All right. Well, thank you all.	
21	That will conclude our oral arguments for our hearing	
22	today.	
23	Are there any closing remarks or comments that	The foregoing certification of this transcript does
24	the commissioners want to make or Mr. Dawson?	not apply to the reproduction of the same by any means, unless under the direct control and/or
25	COMMISSIONER CHRISTMANN: I think only that I	direction of the certifying transcriber.
	PAGE 81	PAGE 83
1	don't know about the other decisionmakers here, but my	
2	preference is to take this under advisement and we'll	
3	release a decision once we've reached one.	
4	ALJ HOGAN: All right. Well, then I will note	
5	for the record that it's 3:51 p.m. and that will	
6	conclude our hearing for today. Thank you.	
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	PAGE 82	

	IND I ODLIO	SEITVICE C	CivilviiCOIOI	<b>\</b>
'80s [1] - 29:24	28 [1] - 49:18 286 [1] - 51:1 28th [1] - 6:3	<b>8,000</b> [2] - 30:3, 74:14 <b>8,000-foot</b> [1] - 15:9 <b>80</b> [1] - 17:15	advisement [2] - 4:16, 82:2 advisory [1] - 67:10 affect [2] - 42:12,	20:1, 20:3 analyzed [3] - 19:11, 29:11, 79:23 answer [8] - 18:18,
'Company [1] - 60:4 'road [1] - 75:10	3	Α	62:10 afternoon [6] - 3:1, 6:24, 7:4, 9:9, 9:12,	26:19, 32:17, 32:19, 64:2, 74:13, 77:18, 80:3
1	<b>3</b> [2] - 44:17, 62:22 <b>30th</b> [3] - 35:3, 39:15	<b>abide</b> [2] - 12:13, 12:25	45:23 agencies [2] - 37:4,	answers [1] - 32:17 anyway [2] - 27:6,
<b>1</b> [2] - 61:11, 79:4	<b>378</b> [2] - 44:6, 44:11 <b>38-22-01</b> [1] - 53:11	<b>ability</b> [2] - 62:10, 66:12	60:5  agency [2] - 9:23,	73:20 apologize [3] - 8:5,
<b>1-06</b> [2] - 79:8, 79:22 <b>1-07</b> [1] - 79:9	<b>380</b> [1] - 44:2 <b>386</b> [1] - 47:20	<b>able</b> [7] - 34:11, 34:12, 34:22, 41:6, 70:6,	54:21	44:8, 44:14 appeal [1] - 51:10
<b>1-08</b> [1] - 79:6 <b>1-09</b> [2] - 79:9, 79:22	<b>3:51</b> [1] - 82:5	73:4, 77:24 absolutely [5] - 46:18,	ago [1] - 41:22 agree [7] - 27:9,	appear [2] - 12:22,
<b>1-13</b> [2] - 79:17, 79:23 <b>10</b> [1] - 15:16	4	65:11, 72:12, 76:1, 76:16	28:24, 29:2, 29:6, 33:11, 53:23, 62:18	14:11 appearance [5] - 6:8,
<b>10-minute</b> [1] - 8:15 <b>11-33-01</b> [2] - 50:15,	<b>4</b> <sub>[3]</sub> - 46:23, 49:17,	<b>absurd</b> [3] - 26:21, 27:20, 27:22	<b>agreement</b> [4] - 25:23, 26:10, 62:22, 62:23	6:10, 6:23, 8:6, 8:8 appearing [1] - 6:14
50:22 <b>114</b> [1] - 49:10	57:21 <b>49-22.1-01</b> [2] - 35:23,	absurdity [1] - 27:20 accept [2] - 63:20,	<b>agreements</b> [19] - 12:5, 13:8, 24:14,	applicant [10] - 12:3, 12:13, 24:23, 37:12,
<b>12</b> [1] - 55:7 <b>15</b> [1] - 54:5	57:11 <b>49-22.1-01(7)(a</b> [1] -	70:4 access [1] - 62:24	24:20, 25:4, 30:23, 31:8, 31:10, 31:12,	37:22, 38:1, 38:4, 60:3, 68:8, 75:25
<b>16</b> [1] - 15:10 <b>1855</b> [1] - 6:13	44:23 <b>49-22.1-02</b> [2] - 48:18,	accomplished [1] - 59:14	32:8, 32:13, 32:14, 38:2, 62:20, 63:5,	<b>Applicant</b> [2] - 6:14, 6:17
<b>1980</b> [1] - 74:12 <b>1980s</b> [2] - 19:19,	48:21 <b>49-22.1-06</b> [1] - 57:22	<b>according</b> [2] - 57:6, 65:20	74:25, 75:2, 75:10, 75:11 agrees [1] - 60:4	<b>applicants</b> [2] - 69:4, 69:8
21:24	<b>49-22.1-13</b> [8] - 24:13, 25:13, 35:17, 36:9,	accurate [1] - 29:5 acquired [1] - 57:4	agricultural [1] -	<b>application</b> [15] - 20:7, 36:23, 38:13,
2	46:20, 49:2, 50:19, 55:18	action [2] - 34:16, 38:23	<b>ahead</b> [5] - 8:25, 36:15, 40:20, 56:8,	40:4, 48:1, 49:2, 55:19, 58:10, 58:11, 59:12, 64:22, 64:24,
<b>2</b> [9] - 5:6, 11:17,	<b>49-22.1-13(2</b> [2] - 11:10, 17:23	actions [1] - 51:21 actively [1] - 69:3	79:1 <b>alive</b> [1] - 46:19	79:8, 79:9, 80:7 <b>applied</b> [7] - 46:7,
13:14, 35:9, 36:10, 46:20, 56:24, 60:21	<b>49-22.1-13(2)</b> [1] - 11:3	<b>actual</b> [4] - 19:11, 19:12, 42:5, 75:4	alleged [1] - 78:7 allotted [3] - 3:18,	51:7, 51:11, 51:21, 58:1, 59:11, 70:17
<b>2(a</b> [1] - 61:17 <b>2(b</b> [3] - 36:10, 46:12,	<b>49-22.1-13(2)(c</b> [1] - 16:3	added [3] - 21:4, 21:12, 32:2	8:18, 8:22 <b>allow</b> [9] - 8:15, 8:19,	<b>applies</b> [5] - 12:1, 38:14, 48:19, 81:1,
61:13 <b>2(c</b> [5] - 24:13, 24:16,	5	additional [3] - 10:19, 55:17, 77:19	17:8, 17:18, 51:18, 59:9, 62:5, 68:18,	81:3 apply [9] - 9:25, 10:5,
37:21, 37:24, 62:18 2(d) [1] - 36:22	<b>5</b> [5] - 39:16, 57:25,	<b>address</b> [7] - 47:7, 47:11, 52:4, 69:5,	71:17 allowance [1] - 80:13	18:16, 34:24, 35:13, 43:21, 51:9, 52:17,
2)(a [1] - 20:10 2)(b [1] - 20:10	58:5, 58:9, 58:17 <b>50</b> [2] - 43:24, 80:3	76:13, 78:24, 81:9 addressed [1] - 51:16	<b>allowed</b> [3] - 70:19, 70:21, 71:3	59:9 <b>applying</b> [6] - 14:12,
<b>20</b> [2] - 7:25, 15:14 <b>20-minute</b> [1] - 8:14	<b>500</b> [3] - 15:10, 30:8, 30:13	addressing [2] - 10:15, 63:1	<b>allowing</b> [2] - 3:17, 69:18	15:4, 18:7, 54:1, 71:2, 79:5
<b>200</b> [9] - 30:2, 30:4, 30:9, 30:12, 47:16,	<b>5th</b> [1] - 6:1	adds [1] - 16:1 Administration [1] -	allows [1] - 36:7 almost [3] - 66:4,	appreciate [1] - 55:23 approach [3] - 13:9,
47:17, 52:12, 74:14 <b>200-foot</b> [1] - 29:25 <b>201</b> [3] - 47:16, 47:17	6	39:6 administrative [3] -	76:18, 80:21 alone [1] - 16:6	18:1, 62:24 appropriate [8] - 14:1,
<b>201</b> [3] - 47:16, 47:17, 48:2 <b>2017</b> [1] - 59:4	<b>6</b> [1] - 59:16	4:25, 5:13, 9:23 administrator [1] -	alternative [1] - 14:9 ambiguity [1] - 13:25	40:14, 57:5, 57:7, 63:11, 67:21, 73:10,
<b>2017</b> [1] - 39.4 <b>2019</b> [1] - 31:24 <b>202</b> [2] - 49:15, 49:17	<b>6th</b> [3] - 34:6, 41:11, 49:8	54:17 admit [1] - 80:8	<b>ambiguous</b> [2] - 27:10, 33:10	73:11 appropriately [1] -
<b>2023</b> [5] - 5:6, 6:1, 6:3, 49:18, 54:5	7	adopt [3] - 35:14, 42:2, 70:1	<b>amended</b> [3] - 20:6, 21:14, 59:8	11:1 approval [1] - 56:22
<b>203</b> [2] - 49:16, 49:22 <b>206</b> [1] - 40:24	<b>7.2</b> [1] - 16:14	adopted [7] - 10:6, 15:8, 15:24, 34:7,	amending [1] - 20:16 amendment [2] -	<b>approved</b> [4] - 36:8, 37:25, 69:8, 69:9
21st [1] - 5:6 22-13.1 [1] - 48:17	<b>792</b> [1] - 51:1	38:12, 49:9, 53:2 advance [4] - 12:12,	20:11, 61:3 amendments [3] -	approves [1] - 36:6 arbitrary [2] - 51:19,
<b>23</b> [2] - 59:18, 59:24 <b>23-003</b> [1] - 40:24	8	30:18, 30:21, 66:18 advanced [1] - 74:18 adverse [4] - 47:1,	14:6, 59:2, 80:17 amount [1] - 28:13	80:4 <b>area</b> [9] - 4:1, 4:2,
<b>25</b> [1] - 53:1	<b>8</b> [2] - 36:2, 39:16	47:4, 47:13, 49:1	amounts [1] - 15:19 analysis [3] - 14:14,	16:13, 48:15, 51:18, 52:9, 52:10, 57:12,
1	1	1	1	Î.

## December 21, 2023, Formal Hearing ND PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

57:17 areas [1] - 48:10 argue [2] - 14:11, 46:10 arguing [5] - 6:19, 30:16, 33:1, 38:25, 53:19 argument [14] - 8:1, 8:16, 8:17, 24:11, 24:14, 33:7, 40:15, 63:17, 74:4, 74:10, 74:17, 74:20, 80:8, 80:25 arguments [13] - 4:5, 4:14, 4:15, 6:6, 8:14, 12:22, 13:3, 19:13, 27:8, 33:13, 46:1, 74:7. 81:21 arose [1] - 34:12 arresters [1] - 16:16 art [1] - 16:13 Article [4] - 20:9, 21:15, 21:19 articulated [1] - 46:22 aside [2] - 32:19, 33:8 aspect [1] - 50:3 Assistant [1] - 6:24 associate [1] - 54:17 assume [1] - 71:2 attached [2] - 35:8, 54:3 Attachment [1] - 54:3 attempt [4] - 19:13, 22:20, 23:17, 23:22 attempted [2] - 22:22, 29:6 attended [1] - 3:22 attorney [2] - 30:1, 62:19 Attorney [1] - 6:25 attorneys [3] - 9:2, 33:3 45:25 August [4] - 44:2, 46:23, 49:17, 49:18 authorities [2] - 23:3, 39:11 authority [18] - 16:21, 35:5, 35:7, 35:10, 36:25, 39:7, 39:8, 39:21. 40:1. 42:2. 54:19, 62:11, 64:15, 66:19, 69:11, 73:25, 76:22, 77:5 automatic [7] - 10:25, 14:10, 14:23, 25:8, 26:20, 40:5, 75:9 automatically [11] -11:23. 12:15. 26:15. 26:16, 27:4, 27:5, 27:21, 27:24, 27:25, 30:19, 37:9 available [1] - 51:13 avoid [3] - 10:21, 18:1,

27:19 **aware** [3] - 10:3, 22:21, 64:20

**B(2)(b)(i)** [1] - 20:13 **b)** [1] - 81:5 **backwards** [1] - 12:23 **Bakke** [6] - 7:3, 7:4, 45:21, 56:5, 59:10, 69:16

**BAKKE** [2] - 7:4, 45:22 **balance** [2] - 17:6,

68:22 **based** [6] - 13:5, 20:1, 40:11, 48:8, 69:18, 77:22

**bases** [1] - 52:2 **basis** [3] - 15:5, 16:4, 54:10

begin [1] - 73:19 beginning [2] - 35:23, 56:19

**behalf** [8] - 6:14, 6:16, 6:25, 7:5, 7:11, 7:15, 7:19, 8:10

behind [1] - 67:22 believes [6] - 10:12, 10:24, 15:5, 15:11, 76:16, 77:18

**Bender** [2] - 6:9, 6:13 **BENDER** [1] - 6:12 **beside** [1] - 4:12

**best** [5] - 9:25, 11:6, 27:10, 69:12, 81:7 **better** [2] - 73:21, 81:5

**better** [2] - 73:21, 81:5 **between** [6] - 3:7, 28:20, 39:18, 59:19, 65:17, 66:23

**beyond** [3] - 15:20, 68:8

big [2] - 62:1, 73:4 binding [1] - 68:2 binds [1] - 11:7

binds [1] - 11:7 Bismarck [13] - 5:10, 6:13, 7:5, 7:10, 8:3, 17:17, 45:21, 48:12, 52:15, 52:20, 79:1,

80:6 bit [5] - 19:2, 19:23, 24:2, 72:14, 80:7 blank [3] - 49:24, 54:4, 54:16

blast [1] - 16:7 block [2] - 15:19, 16:21 blue [1] - 56:11 bluntly [1] - 14:5

**board** [3] - 15:5, 76:3, 76:5

body [2] - 30:8, 33:3 boiled [1] - 14:18 booing [1] - 3:13 books [3] - 19:19, 21:11, 22:2 border [1] - 43:16 bottom [4] - 12:23, 28:2, 57:24, 59:23 boundaries [3] - 30:7, 49:13, 50:9

boundary [1] - 43:20 Box [1] - 6:13 Braaten [7] - 7:17, 7:18, 18:25, 46:17,

50:19, 54:5 **BRAATEN** [5] - 7:18, 19:1, 30:4, 31:1,

32:10 **Bret** [2] - 6:15, 9:10 **brief** [4] - 17:4, 54:4,

57:3, 64:14 **briefing** [2] - 11:1, 23:21

briefly [3] - 24:8, 46:24, 77:17 briefs [1] - 15:23

bring [2] - 20:16, 41:2 bringing [1] - 75:22 brings [1] - 60:18 broad [6] - 23:11,

53:11, 71:17, 75:1,

broadly [1] - 78:18 broke [1] - 60:22 broken [2] - 60:21,

77:1

61:4 **brought** [5] - 10:14, 34:3, 47:6, 69:1, 76:12

**build** [8] - 36:7, 36:20, 40:4, 41:4, 41:16, 65:6, 65:7, 73:7

**building** [7] - 30:5, 30:8, 30:9, 30:11, 42:7, 42:11, 62:25

**built** [2] - 9:19, 42:7 **burden** [6] - 16:2, 28:5, 46:25, 47:4, 68:7, 68:9

**burdensome** [6] - 10:9, 66:2, 68:11, 70:14, 70:16, 72:15 **Burleigh** [53] - 5:24, 7:15, 9:2, 15:12

7:15, 8:2, 15:13, 15:15, 16:5, 16:11, 16:19, 18:13, 23:22, 33:22, 33:25, 34:3, 34:5, 35:4, 35:5, 35:10, 35:12, 35:15, 39:1, 39:12, 39:21, 40:1, 40:8, 45:24, 48:8, 49:9, 49:21, 50:25, 51:2, 51:8, 51:14, 51:15, 51:18, 51:25, 52:7, 52:12, 52:16, 52:21, 52:22, 52:24, 53:6, 70:2, 70:4, 70:11, 70:19, 72:7, 78:9, 81:12 **Byron** [2] - 6:16, 9:10

С

c) [4] - 12:18, 14:13, 74:24, 74:25 camps [1] - 21:20 cannot [1] - 9:19 canons [1] - 31:18 canons' [1] - 27:15 capability [1] - 60:23 Capitol [1] - 5:10 capricious [1] - 51:19 capture [1] - 9:14 Carbon [4] - 3:2, 5:23, 8:1, 9:11 carbon [10] - 9:14, 9:17, 17:10, 17:12, 38:16, 38:18, 53:8, 53:13, 54:22, 54:24 care [1] - 34:12 carefully [2] - 11:10, 11:15 cart [1] - 51:6 carveout [1] - 80:16 Case [1] - 5:9 case [22] - 3:3, 3:8, 15:3, 16:21, 27:12, 37:10, 39:3, 41:21, 43:17, 46:23, 51:1, 51:3, 51:16, 51:17, 57:8, 65:15, 69:2, 69:3, 69:22, 72:19, 75:25, 78:16 caselaw [1] - 78:15 cases [4] - 3:10, 3:21, 67:4. 69:2 categories [4] - 11:14, 12:7, 12:9, 13:10 category [1] - 11:25 cell [3] - 5:20, 5:21 Century [11] - 10:13, 17:23, 25:13, 35:18, 48:17, 50:15, 50:22, 53:10, 56:25, 80:13 **CEO** [2] - 54:4, 54:16 certain [4] - 12:5, 52:7, 53:16, 75:14 certainly [3] - 65:4, 73:3, 78:17 certainty [1] - 70:9 certificate [42] - 11:20, 35:21, 35:24, 35:25,

36:6, 36:19, 36:22,

36:23, 37:9, 46:7,

46:16, 49:6, 56:20, 57:14, 57:15, 57:16, 57:25, 58:6, 58:7, 58:15, 59:10, 59:12, 60:23, 61:8, 62:8, 63:7, 63:8, 63:9, 63:13, 63:22, 65:21, 75:23, 76:2, 78:23, 79:2, 79:9, 79:11, 79:16, 79:18, 79:21 certificates [1] - 57:23 certification [4] - 60:1, 60:2, 61:1 Chad [2] - 7:6, 7:7 Chair [1] - 79:25 **chair** [3] - 3:3, 7:20, 75:9 chance [2] - 4:15, 41:20 change [4] - 32:6, 32:22, 60:16, 74:14 changes [3] - 32:17, 64:21, 72:22 changing [1] - 15:25 chapter [2] - 36:1, 58:3 Charter [3] - 34:8, 34:24, 41:12 check [1] - 5:19 chills [1] - 73:5 CHRISTMANN [28] -3:1, 4:22, 4:24, 9:1, 29:21, 30:14, 31:21, 33:18, 40:21, 41:19, 41:24, 42:13, 42:20, 43:2, 43:5, 43:22, 44:1, 44:5, 44:9, 44:11, 44:16, 44:19, 45:4, 45:11, 64:5, 71:24, 81:17, 81:25 Christmann [7] - 3:3, 5:12, 31:17, 32:11, 53:23, 61:12, 75:9 Christmann's [1] -Circuit [3] - 16:11,

53:23, 61:12, 75:9
Christmann's [1] 80:1
Circuit [3] - 16:11,
16:23, 78:16
citation [1] - 51:1
cite [1] - 44:21
cited [4] - 44:23,
44:25, 78:17, 78:18
cities [4] - 37:1, 43:2,
70:23, 76:5
citizens [3] - 47:3,
47:14, 52:21
city [6] - 30:7, 48:12,
52:20, 53:16, 60:6,
60:14

clarification [1] - 72:1 Class [1] - 9:17

claim [3] - 14:19,

clapping [1] - 3:14

24:18, 53:5

49:23, 50:6, 50:8,

### December 21, 2023, Formal Hearing ND PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

clear [23] - 10:14, 11:11, 13:24, 14:4, 15:6, 16:3, 16:8, 17:23, 31:9, 31:13, 59:5, 63:19, 65:16, 65:24, 66:10, 66:19, 67:8, 68:3, 69:21, 71:15, 72:19, 72:23, 76.2 clearance [1] - 80:2 clearly [13] - 18:9, 25:23, 46:13, 49:19, 52:22, 52:25, 58:24, 65:17, 68:13, 68:25, 76:14, 78:15, 79:4 climbing [1] - 17:16 close [1] - 9:4 closely [1] - 76:14 closer [1] - 48:12 closing [1] - 81:23 CO2 [8] - 9:19, 20:16, 20:25, 21:7, 52:19, 53:20, 54:9, 55:11 coal [3] - 20:20, 21:2, 21:3 Code [12] - 10:13, 17:23, 25:13, 35:18, 48:17, 50:15, 50:22, 53:10, 56:25, 66:17, 80:13 coincidentally [1] -51:2 collaboration [1] -72:16 colleagues [1] - 9:9 combine [1] - 15:22 combined [3] - 32:2, 79:5, 80:7 coming [2] - 20:24, 21:7 comment [2] - 4:23, 78:11 comments [7] - 3:6, 4:18, 11:4, 19:15, 23:21, 33:14, 81:23 commercial [3] -21:19, 52:8, 52:9 commission's [3] -11:19, 11:23, 32:3 Commission's [2] -28:10, 68:13 commissioners [13] -6:13, 8:20, 18:21, 29:19, 40:18, 46:24. 55:22, 56:1, 56:10, 64:19, 71:23, 81:15, 81:24 Commissioners [4] -8:10, 33:25, 45:23, 64.12 committee [1] - 11:5 community [5] - 41:6, 41:13, 42:10, 42:12,

78:12 companies [2] -20:17, 71:18 company [7] - 34:9, 34:14, 34:18, 72:8, 72:9, 73:3, 73:18 compared [1] - 15:9 compatibility [17] -35:25, 36:1, 36:18, 37:10, 38:10, 40:3, 40:11, 46:8, 46:16, 56:21, 57:15, 57:16, 58:7, 61:8, 61:9, 65:21, 78:23 compatible [1] - 48:23 compete [1] - 42:16 competent [1] - 29:4 complies [1] - 31:18 compliments [1] -72:13 comply [8] - 12:4, 37:12, 38:1, 50:3, 51:5, 60:4, 60:8, 60:10 concern [6] - 45:5, 69:14, 72:18, 73:5, 78:7 concerns [11] - 17:8, 17:17, 62:1, 64:21, 66:14, 67:23, 68:16, 68:17, 69:1, 71:14, 75:13 conclude [2] - 81:21, 82:6 confidence [1] - 71:13 confirming [1] - 10:23 conflict [11] - 14:17, 15:7, 16:4, 17:13, 19:10, 19:22, 28:8, 28:20, 53:7, 62:4, 76:23 **conflicts** [1] - 17:5 conform [2] - 66:6, 69:9 conjunction [1] -48:17 consequence [1] consider [3] - 23:3, 67:22, 68:19 consideration [2] -40:12, 66:14 considerations [1] -73.9 considered [1] - 50:12 considering [3] -37:17, 67:24, 68:25

consistent [3] - 61:14,

construct [1] - 36:16

36:3, 36:11, 38:9,

39:9, 46:5, 46:14,

construction [10] -

63:3, 64:24

55:20, 60:25, 61:21, 80.14 construed [3] - 39:13, 57:2, 57:6 contains [1] - 49:20 contradict [2] - 50:21, 53:21 contradicts [1] - 19:24 contrary [4] - 31:2, 48:3, 53:5, 65:22 control [5] - 23:1, 32:23, 60:9, 63:1, 80:13 **controlling** [1] - 16:10 conversion [10] -11:18, 13:16, 45:2, 45:6, 48:22, 57:19, 61:18, 63:8, 66:5, 79:17 copies [2] - 24:4, 56:10 copy [1] - 44:24 corporate [1] - 30:7 correct [8] - 6:20, 30:2, 31:22, 43:25, 45:4, 45:8, 46:18, 61:4 corridor [19] - 35:25, 36:4, 36:13, 36:18, 37:2, 37:10, 37:17, 40:11, 57:16, 57:17, 58:2, 58:6, 58:8, 58:13, 60:1, 61:23, 63:23, 63:24, 67:19 corridors [1] - 66:20 cost [1] - 38:6 Council [1] - 8:12 counsel [1] - 56:11 count [1] - 8:21 counties [16] - 10:3, 10:5, 13:19, 37:1, 50:16, 50:23, 54:7, 54:25, 55:10, 55:14, 63:12, 72:3, 75:24, 76:4, 76:23, 77:4 country [3] - 21:2, 65:2, 71:10 county [31] - 13:17, 15:19, 17:13, 18:6, 18:17, 20:2, 20:6, 20:23, 22:14, 22:15, 34:10, 34:11, 34:16, 34:25, 35:6, 38:11, 38:21, 41:17, 53:18, 53:21, 54:13, 60:6, 60:14, 70:5, 70:21, 77:7, 79:13, 80:9, 80:10, 80:13 County [84] - 5:24, 7:16, 7:19, 7:20, 8:2, 15:8, 15:13, 18:13, 18:25, 19:3, 19:7,

20:4, 20:5, 20:9, 20:12, 20:16, 20:22, 21:6, 21:24, 22:6, 23:8, 23:20, 23:22, 23:23, 28:18, 28:20, 29:10, 33:22, 34:1, 34:3, 34:5, 35:4, 35:5, 35:10, 35:12, 35:15, 39:1, 39:12, 39:21, 40:1, 41:20, 45:24, 48:8, 49:9, 49:21, 49:23, 50:6, 50:8, 50:25, 51:2, 51:8, 51:14, 51:16, 51:18, 51:25, 52:7, 52:12, 52:16, 52:21, 52:22, 52:25, 53:7, 70:2, 70:4, 70:11, 70:12, 70:19, 70:21, 72:3, 72:7, 72:8, 72:23, 74:18, 75:6, 76:12, 78:9, 81:12 county's [2] - 34:7, 51:20 County's [5] - 16:5, 40:8, 44:6, 45:24, 74:10 county-by-county [1] - 18:6 countywide [3] - 34:7, 34:23, 41:12 couple [5] - 3:6, 20:8, 41:21, 58:23, 78:24 course [1] - 47:10 court [9] - 16:22, 18:5, 19:21, 33:15, 53:24, 53:25, 76:19, 78:16, 78:20 Court [2] - 50:24, 59:15 courts [1] - 78:10 cover [7] - 43:11, 43:12, 43:15, 43:18, 43:20, 52:2 coverage [1] - 43:24 covered [3] - 42:23, 43:9, 43:19 covering [1] - 75:1 covers [1] - 43:14 create [3] - 26:19, 32:7, 42:15 created [2] - 29:4, 70:8 creating [1] - 10:8 criteria [4] - 49:3, 49:5, 68:18, 79:10 critical [4] - 32:24, 65:1, 67:2, 71:11 crossings [1] - 62:25 crystal [1] - 76:2 cumulative [1] - 15:22 current [4] - 22:10,

22:18, 30:5, 52:12

D d) [1] - 63:7 Dakota [20] - 5:8, 5:11, 8:11, 9:13, 10:13, 17:15, 18:7, 20:4, 35:18, 47:3, 48:17, 50:14, 50:15, 50:22, 53:10, 57:23, 64:17, 65:2, 66:17, 71:13 damages [1] - 77:13 dandy [1] - 62:21 danger [1] - 33:9 **DAPL** [5] - 59:3, 60:1, 62:1, 62:17 data [2] - 48:8, 48:13 date [3] - 5:7, 6:5, 55:17 dated [2] - 49:17, 54:5 dates [1] - 55:18 **DAWSON** [3] - 4:23, 45:16, 81:19 Dawson [10] - 3:5, 4:22. 18:22. 29:20. 40:19, 45:14, 56:2, 71:23, 81:16, 81:24 days [10] - 12:12, 26:13, 26:17, 27:23, 30:18, 30:21, 37:4, 41:21, 55:7, 70:7 deal [8] - 39:9, 39:10, 41:5. 41:25. 51:25. 52:1, 63:25, 73:8 dealing [1] - 49:11 deals [5] - 37:21, 46:13, 60:1, 61:18, 62:20 dealt [3] - 34:8, 49:10, 49:11 debate [3] - 3:17, 11:2, 11:3 December [1] - 5:6 decide [4] - 54:11, 64:16, 68:12 decided [1] - 65:3 decides [1] - 66:13 deciding [1] - 40:13 decision [20] - 4:17, 10:2, 11:12, 12:17, 13:4, 18:4, 19:21, 19:22, 41:21, 46:23, 47:6, 49:17, 50:24, 53:24, 66:16, 68:14, 75:17, 76:20, 78:18, 82:3 decisionmaker [2] -3:5, 5:16 decisionmakers [1] decisions [1] - 9:22

declare [1] - 5:24

deem [1] - 39:22

19:14, 19:17, 19:19,

## December 21, 2023, Formal Hearing ND PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

deemed [1] - 39:19 deficient [1] - 50:4 defined [4] - 35:22, 57:5, 57:17, 61:19 definition [6] - 16:12. 16:14, 57:7, 57:9, 62:21, 62:22 definitions [3] - 57:9, 57:11, 57:14 degree [1] - 73:17 delay [1] - 44:14 deliver [1] - 4:15 demonstrate [1] -15:23 deny [1] - 29:15 department [1] - 34:20 derrick [1] - 7:18 design [1] - 16:1 designate [4] - 35:2, 58:1, 58:8, 65:21 designated [8] - 5:14, 36:4, 36:12, 57:18, 58:12, 61:23, 63:23, 63:24 designating [4] -36:17, 58:18, 67:18, 67:19 designation [1] - 58:5 designed [1] - 17:6 determinations [1] -75:16 determine [5] - 30:22, 37:18, 54:8, 55:11, 55:18 determined [1] - 51:20 determines [1] - 54:21 determining [1] -56:23 develop [1] - 73:16 developed [2] - 20:22, 21:12 developer [1] - 73:6 development [8] -23:5, 23:13, 65:1, 65:12. 71:11. 73:6. 77:3 difference [2] - 66:17, 67:8 different [21] - 4:3, 10:6, 10:7, 10:8, 13:21, 16:14, 18:1, 18:2. 20:3. 21:15. 21:23, 33:1, 34:2, 35:22, 36:2, 42:6, 52:14, 67:24, 68:4, 69.14 differently [2] - 13:22, 68:4 difficult [4] - 58:21, 67:6, 73:1, 73:15 diminish [1] - 8:6 dioxide [8] - 9:17, 17:10, 17:12, 38:16,

38:18, 53:14, 54:22, 54:24 direct [2] - 56:14, 62:16 directing [1] - 5:17 direction [2] - 69:15, 79:14 directly [4] - 18:7, 50:19, 50:25, 74:13 **Director** [1] - 7:1 directs [1] - 67:8 disagree [3] - 14:10, 14:13, 24:9 disagrees [1] - 15:1 discretion [1] - 12:1 discretionarily [1] -12:17 discuss [2] - 8:24, 75:25 discussed [1] - 74:16 **discusses** [1] - 18:5 discussing [1] - 19:4 discussion [2] -58:20, 59:19 distance [3] - 42:25, 50:1, 53:16 distances [2] - 23:12, 77:2 distinction [4] - 3:21, 18:8, 66:3, 69:21 distinctions [2] - 3:7, 11:16 distinguishes [1] -65:17 District [1] - 8:12 diving [1] - 13:25 docket [1] - 44:9 Docket [4] - 40:24, 44:2, 47:20, 79:4 docketed [1] - 41:21 done [7] - 3:15, 33:5, 45:25, 49:16, 50:2, 50:10, 77:10 door[1] - 70:21 doubt [1] - 68:8 down [8] - 14:18, 20:10, 22:10, 45:15, 57:24, 60:22, 61:4, 69:17 draft [2] - 49:18, 49:20 dual [1] - 42:15 **Dublinske** [8] - 6:9, 6:16, 6:19, 9:6, 9:10, 74:3, 80:20, 81:16 DUBLINSKE [5] -6:15, 6:20, 9:8, 74:5, during [3] - 5:22, 8:17,

61:1

dust [1] - 63:1

duties [1] - 42:17

E easements [3] - 17:16, 73:8, 73:12 east [2] - 48:6, 52:15 eastern [2] - 48:3, edge [1] - 43:23 effect [3] - 12:20, 17:12, 26:25 **effective** [1] - 10:10 effectively [4] - 68:12, 69:19, 70:7, 73:20 effects [1] - 47:2 efficient [3] - 10:10, 10:17, 48:24 efforts [1] - 10:21 Eighth [3] - 16:10, 16:23, 78:16 either [6] - 5:20, 10:18, 10:20, 14:2, 74:8, 79:14 electric [3] - 15:16, 20:18, 66:4 elsewhere [2] - 25:16. embodied [1] - 75:14 emergency [11] -34:12, 34:16, 34:19, 34:21, 34:23, 38:23, 41:7, 41:14, 41:18, 49:19 Emmons [40] - 5:24, 7:19, 7:20, 8:2, 15:8, 16:19, 18:13, 18:25, 19:3, 19:7, 19:14, 19:17, 19:19, 20:4, 20:5, 20:8, 20:11, 20:16, 20:21, 21:6, 21:24, 22:5, 23:8, 23:20, 23:23, 28:18, 28:20, 29:10, 44:6, 45:24, 53:7, 70:20, 72:8, 72:23, 74:10, 74:18, 75:6, 76:12, 81:12 empty [1] - 50:2 encourage [2] - 69:4, 76:14 encroachments [1] -77:13 end [3] - 11:6, 71:5, 71:20 ended [1] - 32:25 Energy [2] - 54:18, 76:19 energy [6] - 45:2, 45:6, 48:22, 57:19,

entered [1] - 14:19 entire [3] - 13:20, 31:7, 34:25 entirely [1] - 13:2 entities [1] - 40:6 entry [1] - 57:13 environment [2] -47:2, 47:14 environmental [5] -47:5, 48:24, 49:1, 68:20, 73:9 envisioned [1] - 59:6 equal [1] - 3:18 equally [2] - 15:21, 71:3 equivalent [1] - 54:21 era [1] - 3:12 Erin [1] - 7:20 error [2] - 45:8, 45:10 especially [2] - 16:18, 39:4 essentially [1] - 74:18 establish [3] - 9:16, 66:19, 70:6 established [7] - 22:8, 30:6, 30:11, 57:18, 58:24, 71:1, 72:20 establishes [1] -16:12 establishing [1] -45:25 evaluating [3] - 58:25, 62:19, 64:21 event [3] - 14:1, 28:22, 41.18 eventually [1] - 69:8 evidence [20] - 14:19, 15:3, 24:24, 26:1, 28:4, 28:6, 28:13, 28:15, 28:17, 28:23, 29:4, 29:12, 37:23, 38:5, 68:1, 68:2, 68:6. 68:10. 70:15 evidentiary [6] - 3:23, 4:3, 10:18, 15:2, 28:5, 28:12 exact [2] - 59:8, 75:24 exactly [2] - 26:23, 51:15 example [5] - 13:16, 15:8. 16:5. 52:5. 69:16 Except [3] - 25:12, 36:10, 61:20 except [1] - 25:18 exceptions [1] - 78:4 excessive [1] - 15:21 exclusive [1] - 54:19 exercise [1] - 23:7

exercised [2] - 23:11,

Exhibit [4] - 35:9,

77:1

49:17, 49:22, 52:12 Exhibits [2] - 47:16, 49.15 existed [1] - 21:11 existing [2] - 20:12, 21:13 expanded [1] - 63:18 expert [2] - 9:23, 17:24 expertise [1] - 10:1 explain [5] - 10:22, 24:8, 31:22, 46:3, 72:14 explained [1] - 28:19 explains [1] - 25:20 explicit [2] - 16:17, 27:1 express [2] - 13:7, expressed [2] - 64:20, 64:21 expressly [2] - 63:22, 76:4 extensive [2] - 79:11, 79:12 extent [5] - 17:2, 17:11, 18:15, 48:6, 52.1 extraction [1] - 21:21 extraordinarily [1] -72:25 extraordinary [1] -62:24 extreme [2] - 15:13, 72.21 extremely [4] - 32:24, 70:20, 71:17, 76:17 F

face [3] - 15:6, 15:12, 15:18 faces [1] - 3:22 facilities [13] - 4:7, 11:19, 11:22, 12:2, 12:10, 13:16, 14:24, 20:19, 21:17, 42:3, 48:22, 48:23, 65:18 facility [24] - 12:24, 18:10, 36:4, 36:12, 36:24, 37:25, 42:5, 42:8, 45:2, 45:3, 45:6, 45:10, 57:20, 58:2, 58:12, 61:18, 61:22, 63:8, 63:10, 65:19, 65:23, 66:5, 79:18, 79:19 fact [11] - 15:23, 19:18, 32:15, 48:7, 50:24, 54:11, 54:15, 55:13, 68:3, 75:19 factor [1] - 50:11

59:19, 65:12

engage [1] - 16:9

engineer [1] - 70:9

engineering [1] - 16:1

## December 21, 2023, Formal Hearing ND PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

factors [5] - 13:5, 14:13, 14:20, 15:4, 38:6 factory [1] - 32:18 facts [2] - 3:25, 67:16 failed [3] - 46:25, 47:3, 51:4 fair [2] - 4:15, 31:19 fairly [3] - 24:5, 72:19, 72:23 fall [3] - 39:18, 39:19, 39.23 falling [1] - 39:14 false [1] - 53:9 familiar [1] - 3:22 far [1] - 28:2 farm [2] - 66:6, 66:22 fatality [1] - 16:8 Federal [4] - 10:7, 54:14, 54:18, 78:11 federal [23] - 14:17, 15:7, 16:10, 16:13, 16:22, 17:1, 18:4, 19:21, 23:14, 23:18, 28:21, 39:7, 39:23, 39:24, 53:23, 53:25, 54:21, 55:3, 76:19, 76:24, 78:10, 78:14, 78:15 feet [11] - 15:10, 30:3, 30:4, 30:8, 30:12, 30:13, 43:24, 74:14, 80:3 few [1] - 66:23 field [1] - 23:17 file [6] - 12:10, 26:17, 27:21, 37:4, 37:7, 67:14 filed [12] - 5:23, 6:2, 16:22, 19:21, 22:24, 26:12, 27:5, 27:23, 36:24, 55:8, 58:14, 59:17 filing [5] - 14:25, 26:22, 26:25, 44:2 final [1] - 67:19 finally [4] - 63:6, 63:9, 69:6, 77:15 financial [1] - 78:19 findings [2] - 28:9, firm [2] - 6:2, 7:11 Firm [1] - 7:19 first [28] - 8:2, 9:16, 9:23, 11:13, 14:21, 19:7, 20:24, 28:23, 34:5, 34:11, 34:18, 38:20. 44:20. 45:25. 47:8, 51:10, 51:12, 54:15, 56:14, 56:19, 57:13, 59:2, 61:7, 62:19, 63:6, 67:18, 78:25

fixed [1] - 65:23 flawed [1] - 80:11 flexible [1] - 72:24 flip [3] - 58:9, 62:21, 81:4 flippant [1] - 32:17 flipping [1] - 61:11 flowchart [1] - 11:12 folks [1] - 20:8 follow [1] - 79:25 followed [1] - 8:2 following [3] - 8:14, 58:2, 60:11 follows [2] - 63:3, 63:4 football [1] - 71:6 footballs [1] - 67:3 footprint [1] - 48:7 force [1] - 71:18 forces [1] - 32:25 foremost [1] - 9:23 formal [2] - 3:2, 4:4 forth [3] - 11:1, 13:10, 34:15 forward [2] - 47:7, 75:24 foundation [2] - 29:1, 29:3 foundational [1] -65:1

four [3] - 21:15, 21:23, 44:20 fracture [1] - 16:16 frankly [3] - 63:17, 67:3, 75:17 Fredrikson [2] - 6:16, 9:10 front [4] - 21:18, 24:7, 33:16, 76:19 fully [1] - 25:16 fundamentally [3] - 67:6, 78:9, 80:11

G

gas [15] - 4:7, 13:16, 20:20, 22:3, 36:3, 36:11, 36:23, 45:6, 54:20, 57:19, 58:11, 61:22, 63:9, 65:18, 66:22 Gas [2] - 45:1, 45:2 general [2] - 80:12, 80:14 General [1] - 6:25 generating [2] - 75:23, 76:2 generic [1] - 49:20 geological [1] - 53:13 GIS [2] - 48:8, 48:13 given [1] - 7:25 glad [1] - 76:12 goals [1] - 64:20

governed [2] - 53:2, government [3] - 23:1, 23:16 30:17 Government [3] -10:7, 54:14, 78:11 governmental [1] -37:3 governments [18] -17:19, 21:4, 23:2, 23:7. 23:11. 24:1. 26:22, 27:21, 55:10, 65:14, 66:14, 67:10, 67:14, 67:25, 69:3, 69:19, 76:25, 77:10 governs [3] - 20:11, 57:12, 57:23 granted [3] - 9:22, 62:12, 73:18 granting [1] - 81:2 grants [1] - 18:15 great [1] - 69:16 group [1] - 6:1 guess [1] - 59:1 guidance [1] - 19:24 guide [1] - 10:20 guideline [1] - 37:19

Н

hand [2] - 11:22,

handed [2] - 20:7,

65:23

29:22

handful [2] - 11:5, 17:18 handle [1] - 34:22 handout [2] - 59:24, 59:25 handy [1] - 62:21 handy-dandy [1] -62:21 hang [1] - 76:24 happy [3] - 18:18, 55:23, 64:2 hard [1] - 9:3 harder [1] - 78:5 hate [1] - 75:22 hats [1] - 76:25 HAUGEN [7] - 4:20, 33:20, 64:6, 71:25, 72:5, 74:1, 81:18 Haugen [3] - 3:4, 4:19, 77:16 HAUGEN-HOFFART [7] - 4:20, 33:20, 64:6, 71:25, 72:5, 74:1, 81:18 Haugen-Hoffart [3] -3:4, 4:19, 77:16 hazard [2] - 34:17, 38:22

Hazardous [1] - 39:5 hazardous [2] - 38:15, 38:19 hear [3] - 6:5, 9:3, 73:23 heard [6] - 17:16, 21:2, 21:3, 22:14, 41:25, 58:21 hearing [28] - 3:2, 3:19, 4:4, 5:1, 5:7, 5:9, 5:15, 5:22, 6:2, 6:4, 6:5, 7:23, 7:24, 15:1, 26:13, 26:18, 27:24, 28:12, 37:5, 55:17, 59:14, 70:1, 70:7, 73:13, 79:5, 81:21, 82:6 hearings [3] - 3:11, 3:23. 58:3 heart [1] - 69:12 heavy [1] - 74:19 Heinert [1] - 60:12 held [1] - 5:9 help [2] - 3:16, 56:17 helpful [3] - 24:6, 60:21, 60:22 helps [3] - 10:21, 15:1, 61:6 high [1] - 16:12 hissing [1] - 3:13 history [15] - 3:11, 14:1, 14:3, 27:10, 27:13, 27:14, 32:21, 33:9, 33:12, 33:14, 58:20, 59:5, 59:17, 59:18, 62:1

hit [1] - 46:4

77:16

Hoffart [3] - 3:4, 4:19,

HOFFART [7] - 4:20,

72:5, 74:1, 81:18

idea [4] - 21:2, 21:3,

identical [1] - 66:5

21:25, 70:5

home [1] - 51:17

33:20, 64:6, 71:25,

Home [3] - 34:7, 34:24, 41:12 77:2 Honor [10] - 6:12, 6:15, 6:20, 8:9, 9:8, 39:24 17:14, 29:21, 41:23, 74:5, 81:6 Hope [2] - 4:25, 5:13 hopefully [3] - 10:16, 65:4, 74:9 27:20, 74:25 horse [1] - 51:6 huge [1] - 15:19 human [3] - 47:4, 39:7 49:1, 68:20 I 29.1 indicator [1] - 11:6

identified [1] - 26:7 identify [1] - 34:6 ignores [2] - 13:6, 74.24 illogical [3] - 30:20, 31:2, 31:17 imagine [1] - 70:25 impact [3] - 15:22, 47:5, 49:1 impacted [2] - 38:2, 48:15 impacts [8] - 13:18, 47:1, 47:13, 68:20, 68:21 impermissible [1] -13:2 impinges [1] - 23:15 implement [2] - 69:25, 71:3 implementation [2] -12:8. 13:12 implemented [1] -23:2 implementing [1] -16:23 imply [1] - 37:15 important [6] - 11:16, 19:20, 32:24, 35:19, 50:14, 65:5 importantly [2] -19:25, 20:15 imposed [1] - 39:1 impossible [1] - 70:8 inaccurate [1] - 47:24 incentive [1] - 26:24 include [3] - 14:15, 61:19, 75:2 included [3] - 17:3, 56:24, 57:10 includes [6] - 11:24, 23:13, 45:7, 56:11, 58:17, 62:23 including [5] - 11:21, 17:10, 23:12, 60:6, incompatible [1] incorrect [1] - 79:3 increased [1] - 30:13 incredibly [1] - 73:15 indeed [3] - 11:11, independent [1] - 3:5 indicate [2] - 6:10, indicated [1] - 5:12 indicates [1] - 36:10 indicating [2] - 25:15,

individual [3] - 39:11,

54:25, 70:22

## December 21, 2023, Formal Hearing ND PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

individuals [1] - 77:8 industry's [1] - 59:19 influence [1] - 62:10 inform [1] - 67:16 information [11] -34:9. 34:10. 34:19. 34:20, 38:21, 41:17, 47:22, 49:20, 49:24, 67:17, 76:7 infrastructure [13] -13:18, 17:7, 64:25, 65:2, 65:8, 65:9, 65:15, 66:4, 66:20, 66:22, 67:7, 69:7, inherently [2] - 77:20, 78:5 initial [3] - 49:16, 49:22, 74:20 injection [1] - 9:17 input [1] - 66:13 inside [2] - 43:8, 61:3 instruct [1] - 68:19 integrity [1] - 65:8 intend [1] - 19:4 intended [3] - 17:4, 17:8, 78:15 intent [5] - 11:4, 11:7, 17:11, 32:21, 72:11 **intention** [1] - 58:8 interest [2] - 53:13, 69:11 interested [2] - 49:14, 50:9 interesting [1] - 47:18 interestingly [1] -15:16 interests [2] - 17:6, 17:21 interfere [1] - 62:11 interpret [6] - 27:15, 27:17, 27:19, 33:6, 33:16 56:23 interpretation [12] -11:2, 13:3, 14:11, 19:5, 24:3, 24:9, 27:7, 27:15, 31:19, 63:12, 74:17, 75:4 interpreted [3] - 14:6, 50.20 50.21 **interprets** [1] - 55:4 interruptions [1] -5:22 interstate [1] - 54:20 intervene [1] - 35:9 intervenors [10] - 6:1, 7:6, 7:12, 8:3, 45:21, 56:7, 74:8, 76:24, introduction [1] - 79:4 invalidated [1] - 71:19 invested [1] - 9:15

investment [1] - 17:22 investments [1] - 17:7 involve [2] - 77:11, 77.12 involved [1] - 11:4 involves [1] - 51:2 involvina [1] - 51:3 lowa [12] - 16:22, 18:4, 19:21, 20:2, 50:13, 53:24, 53:25, 54:1, 75:22, 76:20 isolated [2] - 11:4, 14.2 issuance [4] - 35:20, 35:21, 56:20, 58:15 issue [26] - 10:16, 10:18, 10:24, 11:1, 15:2, 16:25, 18:17, 19:4, 19:12, 24:2, 28:5, 29:15, 47:9, 49:6, 49:11, 55:12, 56:12, 58:6, 60:18, 65:5, 65:20, 65:24, 75:6, 77:15, 78:23, 81:9 issued [8] - 4:6, 5:8, 6:4, 36:1, 62:3, 62:7, 62:8, 76:3 issues [5] - 46:21, 47:8, 52:4, 69:5,

#### J

itself [4] - 19:6, 24:10,

issuing [2] - 36:21,

75:3

40:10

33:10, 55:5

jigsaw [1] - 18:1

job [1] - 45:25

jobs [1] - 17:22 John [1] - 7:6 joined [1] - 3:4 joint [1] - 59:11 Judge [7] - 4:22, 5:2, 19:1, 33:24, 45:22, 64:11, 78:18 judge [13] - 3:5, 3:19, 4:25, 5:13, 16:23, 42:14, 42:18, 53:25, 54:10, 55:3, 55:4, 76:20 judge's [2] - 41:20, Julie [2] - 7:15, 33:25 jump [2] - 59:18, 78:25 jumping [1] - 61:20 junkyards [1] - 21:20 jurisdiction [9] - 23:8, 54:14, 55:12, 60:5, 70:17, 71:2, 71:17,

73:13, 73:25 jurisdictions [3] -54:8, 62:5, 66:11 justifiable [1] - 51:21

#### K

keep [5] - 41:5, 61:2, 64:13, 64:14, 75:22 keeping [1] - 8:16 Keiser [1] - 14:5 kept [1] - 48:7 Kevin [1] - 8:10 Kidder [1] - 70:11 kind [5] - 18:1, 47:18, 56:13, 65:8, 73:5 kinds [2] - 62:4, 70:25 Kinley [1] - 78:16 Knoll [2] - 6:2, 7:11 knowable [1] - 77:23 knowing [3] - 14:7, 61:13, 76:9 knowledge [2] - 46:5, 52:17 known [1] - 8:11 knows [2] - 7:12, 31:10 Kranda [3] - 59:23, 60:20, 61:6

#### L

Laborers [4] - 8:4, 8:11, 64:9, 64:12 lacking [1] - 28:13 laid [1] - 68:18 land [31] - 4:8, 11:24, 18:10, 20:5, 20:23, 21:11, 21:12, 21:13, 21:15, 21:18, 21:23, 23:4, 23:12, 23:24, 36:13, 40:5, 52:1, 52:3, 52:8, 53:18, 57:18, 60:13, 61:24, 62:9, 65:25, 66:6, 66:8, 66:15, 77:1, 77:5, 80:13 landowner [3] - 7:12, 8:3. 56:7 landowners [8] -17:20, 22:20, 49:13, 50:8, 56:6, 69:1, 79:1, 80:6 language [34] - 10:13, 11:8, 11:15, 13:23, 14:7, 14:23, 16:10, 18:8, 18:9, 19:11, 24:6, 24:8, 24:10, 24:15, 25:10, 25:20, 26:2, 27:9, 27:14, 31:3, 31:14, 31:20,

32:1, 32:25, 33:6, 33:10, 33:16, 44:20, 58:13, 63:3, 63:4, 66:5, 75:5 largely [2] - 54:24, 74:20 larger [1] - 15:10 last [6] - 8:7, 10:4, 26:4, 31:21, 58:4, 58:16 late [1] - 44:2 latitude [1] - 50:1 Law [1] - 7:18 law [41] - 4:13, 4:25, 5:13, 6:2, 7:10, 10:2, 11:9, 14:18, 15:7, 16:10, 17:1, 17:5, 17:8, 17:13, 18:7, 23:15, 23:18, 28:21, 31:24, 45:6, 48:16, 53:6, 53:8, 53:21, 54:1, 55:2, 57:5, 62:8, 64:24, 65:16, 65:20, 65:24, 67:8, 67:12, 67:13, 68:2, 75:18, 76:24, 77:23, 77:25, 78:15 Lawrence [1] - 6:13 laws [3] - 16:4, 19:10, 19:22

lawyer [7] - 33:23, 40:21, 45:19, 46:4, 46:17, 49:7, 50:18 Lawyer [3] - 7:14, 7:15, 33:25 LAWYER [20] - 7:15, 33:24, 41:3, 41:23, 42:4, 42:18, 43:1, 43:3, 43:15, 43:25, 44:4, 44:7, 44:10, 44:12, 44:14, 44:18, 44:25, 45:9, 45:13, 45:18 lead [1] - 77:21 leader [1] - 9:14 least [5] - 26:13, 56:18, 63:14, 63:19, 71:3 left [5] - 7:1, 39:11, 55:13, 71:4, 75:21 legal [6] - 3:24, 4:4, 4:15, 44:20, 69:21, 81:8 legislation [2] - 18:8, 76:10 legislative [17] - 11:7,

13:25, 14:3, 14:23,

27:9, 27:12, 27:13,

32:16, 32:20, 33:9,

33:12, 33:14, 58:20,

59:4, 59:16, 59:18,

legislators [3] - 11:5,

61:25

14:4, 32:23 Legislature [11] -13:22, 14:7, 31:9, 32:5, 32:15, 33:2, 33:8, 57:1, 58:25, 65:17, 66:3 Leibel [8] - 6:2, 7:9, 7:10, 7:11, 56:7, 64:4, 64:8, 80:25 **LEIBEL** [2] - 7:10, 56.9 length [3] - 15:17, 16:19, 79:24 letter [12] - 19:24, 22:24, 23:10, 39:4, 54:4, 54:15, 55:7, 60:2, 60:3, 76:13, 76:17, 76:18 letters [1] - 67:25 lifting [1] - 74:19 limitation [1] - 13:7 line [6] - 15:17, 28:2, 43:9, 43:16, 66:7, 69:22 linear [8] - 13:18, 64:25, 65:9, 65:15, 65:18, 65:19, 66:20, 67:7 lines [7] - 22:3, 44:20, 44:22, 53:15, 65:10, 69:20 liquid [13] - 4:7, 18:10, 36:3, 36:12, 36:23, 38:15, 38:19, 45:1, 45:3, 45:6, 58:12, 61:22, 63:10 list [11] - 8:6, 11:20, 11:24, 12:23, 18:24, 33:22, 45:20, 56:6, 77:9, 77:11, 79:13 listening [1] - 72:14 listing [1] - 26:6 lists [2] - 79:11, 79:12 literally [2] - 25:14, 79:20 LIUNA [1] - 8:10 live [4] - 3:12, 43:8, 43:22, 71:7 **LLC** [2] - 5:23, 6:2 lobbyist [2] - 59:20, 60:7 Local [1] - 23:10 local [81] - 4:8, 11:20, 12:10, 12:14, 12:25, 17:3, 17:11, 17:19, 18:10, 19:12, 21:4, 22:25, 23:1, 23:2, 23:7, 23:16, 24:1, 25:21, 25:24, 26:7, 26:9, 26:11, 26:22, 27:20, 28:16, 29:14, 30:17, 32:23, 35:19,

36:13, 37:12, 39:11,

### December 21, 2023, Formal Hearing ND PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

40:6, 40:9, 40:11,
46:11, 46:19, 54:8,
54:14, 55:2, 60:13,
60:14, 61:23, 62:5,
62:9, 62:15, 63:12,
63:24, 65:14, 65:22,
65:25, 66:6, 66:8,
66:11, 66:14, 66:15,
67:4, 67:10, 67:14,
67:23, 67:25, 68:16,
68:20, 68:25, 69:3,
69:12, 69:18, 71:2,
71:14, 73:13, 73:24,
75:14, 76:1, 76:3,
76:25, 77:10
localities [2] - 12:10,
23:3
locals [3] - 60:8, 62:9,
63:14
located [3] - 37:2,
53:20, 64:16
location [12] - 36:6,
36:8, 36:19, 47:1,
47:12, 48:9, 48:10,
50:1, 52:7, 52:19,
57:19, 66:12
locations [3] - 50:13,
52:11, 53:3
logic [1] - 30:16
logical [3] - 13:13,
13:15, 75:12
long-planning [1] -
77:21
longitude [1] - 50:1
look [28] - 11:15,
20:10, 21:10, 24:15,
25:11, 25:16, 26:4,
27:13, 32:20, 33:5,
36:21, 37:11, 39:4, 43:4, 47:25, 50:5,
52:13, 53:10, 59:25,
69:23, 72:22, 75:11,
76:21, 77:11, 77:25,
79:3, 79:7, 79:10
Look [1] - 73:11
looked [2] - 11:10,
61:1
looking [7] - 33:9,
33:11, 36:9, 40:9,
59:2, 70:10, 72:24
looks [2] - 73:6, 78:18
losing [1] - 60:9
<b>low</b> [1] - 68:6
M

# magic [1] - 58:13

Magrum [2] - 7:20, 22:12 maintain [1] - 3:16 maintaining [1] -65:11

maintenance [1] majority [1] - 11:8 manage [1] - 17:24 management [1] -34:20 manner [3] - 3:12, 5:18, 48:23 map [9] - 28:25, 29:3, 29:4, 29:5, 35:8, 52:12, 69:15, 69:23, 72:3 maps [2] - 15:22, 47:16 March [6] - 34:6, 35:3, 39:15, 41:11, 49:8 marked [3] - 3:13, 49:15, 69:24 Materials [1] - 39:6 materials [2] - 10:19, 78:17 matter [3] - 5:16, 6:11, 9:13 matters [1] - 8:23 mature [1] - 3:19 Mayberry [1] - 54:16 mean [7] - 8:5, 26:21, 30:20, 43:11, 68:15, 72:11, 73:19 meaning [4] - 27:16, 47:22, 57:5, 57:7 meaningful [1] - 47:22 means [7] - 5:16, 25:17, 35:24, 57:15, 57:17, 57:19, 68:16 meant [2] - 31:11, 38:17 23:6, 63:1

measure [1] - 68:9 measures [3] - 23:4, media [1] - 48:4 meet [3] - 46:25, 47:3, 49:3

meetings [2] - 3:11, 3:13

meets [2] - 49:4, 49:5 member [1] - 64:12 mention [1] - 79:14 mentioned [4] - 9:10, 21:17, 41:1, 74:19 merely [4] - 5:17, 15:23, 21:23, 53:11 merge [1] - 42:1 message [1] - 9:1 met [2] - 32:25, 46:24 mic [1] - 9:4

mics [1] - 9:3 middle [1] - 11:25 midpoint [1] - 59:22 might [4] - 43:23, 67:24, 73:14 miles [10] - 15:13,

15:16, 43:1, 43:3. 43:6. 43:12. 43:18. 43:23, 71:1, 80:2 miles-long [1] - 71:1 mill [1] - 78:6 minimal [2] - 47:1, 47:13 minimize [2] - 47:4, 49.1 mining [1] - 21:21 Minnesota [3] - 8:11, 67:1. 71:7 minute [1] - 60:12 minutes [2] - 7:25, mitigation [2] - 34:17, 38:22 mix [1] - 3:24 mobile [1] - 51:17 modifies [1] - 63:5 Moldenhauer [1] - 7:7 moment [1] - 46:3 momentarily [1] -10.22 moreover [1] - 17:2 most [3] - 14:5, 69:7, 81:6 motion [10] - 5:7, 5:24, 6:4, 6:6, 10:14, 14:25, 29:15, 34:4, 55:8, 80:9 move [4] - 48:5, 48:11, 48:13. 69:17 moving [2] - 26:2, 62:18 multi [1] - 18:17 multi-county [1] -18:17 multiple [4] - 13:19, 35:12, 69:2, 74:7 must [10] - 12:13, 12:25, 26:12, 48:25, 51:12. 57:6. 58:14. 60:8, 60:13, 66:6

#### Ν

N.W.2d [1] - 51:1 name [1] - 5:12 narrower [2] - 11:24, 78:10 natural [1] - 81:6 nature [2] - 13:21, 19:17 naught [1] - 9:18 NDCC [1] - 48:21 near [2] - 12:19, 43:22 nearly [1] - 15:8 necessarily [1] - 64:18 necessary [1] - 28:15 need [10] - 8:23, 25:25, 27:13, 30:21,

40:2, 61:4, 73:22, 73:23, 74:23, 77:24 needed [2] - 14:1, 69:9 needs [6] - 10:20, 13:19, 40:9, 50:11, 66:19, 73:23 neglected [1] - 76:13 never [3] - 3:15, 51:7, 51:11 new [6] - 12:8, 20:22, 21:12. 32:1. 54:23. 73:14 newer [1] - 80:15 next [12] - 7:20, 18:24, 33:22, 43:10, 43:21, 44:22, 45:20, 56:6, 58:10, 64:9, 70:1, 70:21 nightmare [1] - 71:8 nobody [2] - 52:5, 76:16 non [1] - 65:18 non-linear [1] - 65:18 none [2] - 71:24, 77:11 North [20] - 5:8, 5:10, 8:11, 9:13, 10:13, 17:14, 18:7, 20:4, 35:17, 47:3, 48:17, 50:14, 50:15, 50:21, 53:10, 57:22, 64:17, 65:2, 66:17, 71:13 north [1] - 52:15 notably [2] - 74:12, 76:21 note [4] - 35:20, 47:19, 80:20, 82:4 noted [1] - 75:9 nothing [13] - 23:14, 23:19, 38:15, 38:20, 46:17, 47:7, 49:20, 50:2, 53:19, 79:20, 79:22, 80:23 notice [2] - 5:7, 6:4 notification [1] - 26:5 notify [1] - 36:25 noting [1] - 74:11 notion [1] - 80:9 November [1] - 6:3 nowhere [3] - 71:4, 73:13, 79:12 number [7] - 29:2, 44:6, 44:7, 44:9, 44:25, 46:18, 46:21

#### 0

numerous [1] - 19:15

oath [1] - 3:24 obligation [3] - 33:4, 33:5, 33:16

obtain [1] - 73:4 obviously [6] - 15:18, 22:13, 74:7, 75:12, 79:23. 80:15 occupied [3] - 15:9, 15:14, 29:25 occur [1] - 34:21 October [1] - 5:25 offend [1] - 76:15 officer [1] - 5:15 officials [2] - 17:3, 23:16 often [2] - 13:19, 27:12 oil [2] - 20:20, 22:3 once [9] - 21:3, 37:15, 62:6, 62:8, 62:14, 63:19, 63:20, 76:2, 82:3 one [42] - 4:5, 13:17, 14:3, 15:21, 18:15, 20:7, 21:2, 21:16, 21:23, 22:18, 23:4, 28:8, 29:2, 29:22, 31:7, 31:25, 35:2, 35:3, 41:10, 42:6, 42:21, 43:9, 43:13, 43:24, 44:2, 46:3, 51:22, 51:25, 56:16, 58:19, 58:24, 59:14, 60:8, 60:23, 62:1, 66:11, 69:23, 71:8, 72:19, 80:2, 82:3 ones [1] - 16:18 operate [1] - 55:1 operating [1] - 42:9 operation [1] - 42:8 opinion [4] - 4:1, 19:25, 20:1, 42:19 opinions [3] - 3:25, 4:11 opponents [1] - 17:18 opportunity [3] -55:24, 67:15, 76:6 opposed [1] - 43:7 opposition [2] - 67:4, 67:5 oral [5] - 4:4, 4:14, 6:5, 8:1, 81:21 order [6] - 28:11, 28:15, 29:13, 71:11, 74:6, 81:4 orderly [4] - 3:12, 5:17, 48:23, 65:12 Ordinance [1] - 40:23 ordinance [77] -12:11. 16:5. 16:11. 17:11, 19:3, 19:8, 19:12, 19:14, 19:17, 19:18, 20:5, 20:9, 20:12, 20:16, 20:22,

21:10, 21:24, 22:6,

23:20, 23:24, 25:21,

# December 21, 2023, Formal Hearing ND PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

25:22, 26:10, 27:1, 28:16, 28:18, 28:20, 28:23, 28:24, 29:10, 29:11, 29:14, 29:24, 30:12, 34:5, 34:6, 34:7, 34:8, 34:13, 34:23, 35:1, 35:3, 35:7, 35:11, 35:13, 35:16, 38:12, 38:14, 38:17, 38:20, 39:2, 39:13, 39:15, 39:16, 39:20, 39:25, 40:22, 41:9, 41:11, 41:12, 42:21, 43:11, 43:14, 43:15, 43:19, 50:5, 51:14, 60:15, 60:16, 62:15, 70:2, 70:3, 72:6, 74:11, 78:6 ordinances [49] -5:24, 10:4, 11:25, 14:24, 15:7, 15:24, 16:19, 18:13, 19:15, 24:25, 25:2, 25:5, 25:24, 26:22, 27:21, 30:18, 30:23, 31:6, 31:13, 31:14, 34:2, 34:5, 35:19, 37:5, 37:16, 37:18, 37:23, 40:9, 40:10, 46:11, 51:24, 52:16, 52:17, 53:3, 53:7, 53:21, 63:24, 66:15, 67:15, 67:22, 70:6, 72:20, 72:21, 75:7, 76:1, 76:4, 78:4, 79:13, 81:12 ordinary [1] - 27:16 organized [1] - 30:7 original [3] - 34:3, 48:1, 48:10 otherwise [5] - 8:11, 10:19, 12:14, 37:14, 62:11 ourselves [1] - 36:15 outset [1] - 81:10 outside [1] - 35:15 overlapping [1] - 10:9 overrule [1] - 55:5 overwhelmingly [1] -10:25 own [8] - 4:11, 16:12, 35:7, 35:14, 70:2, 70:6, 70:23, 75:15

#### Р

p.m [2] - 5:6, 82:5 packet [2] - 56:11, 57:10 page [7] - 13:24, 20:15, 29:22, 44:17, 54:15, 59:18, 59:24 pages [2] - 20:8, 42:14 paragraph [23] -11:17, 11:18, 11:21, 12:4, 12:6, 12:13, 12:16, 12:18, 12:24, 13:1, 13:5, 13:6, 13:7, 14:13, 14:15, 16:3, 44:17, 54:18, 59:23, 60:11, 74:18, 74:20 81:2 paragraphs [6] -11:13, 12:7, 12:21, 13:9, 13:23, 74:22 parameters [2] -39:14, 39:19 parks [1] - 21:19 part [10] - 27:11, 32:6, 37:1, 53:2, 54:6, 60:17, 63:25, 67:17, 76:24 participate [1] - 76:5 particular [4] - 20:2, 41:16, 48:14, 68:9 particularly [2] -19:20. 31:4 parties [5] - 6:7, 7:24, 12:22, 14:9, 59:9 parts [2] - 18:2, 63:20 party [6] - 7:25, 8:14, 18:24, 33:22, 45:20, party's [2] - 8:17, 8:20 passed [5] - 10:4, 11:8, 14:7, 22:1, 35:11 past [2] - 3:8, 3:10 patchwork [1] - 10:9 path [2] - 17:23, 69:24 pathway [2] - 35:14, 70:3 Pause [1] - 44:13 peculiar [2] - 57:4, 57:6 Pelham [2] - 6:22, 6:25 PELHAM [1] - 6:24 people [1] - 3:23 percent [2] - 17:15, 53:1 **performing** [1] - 61:2 permissive [1] - 72:24 permit [52] - 11:23, 12:3, 18:9, 18:14, 24:17, 24:22, 27:22, 32:3, 35:21, 36:1, 36:2, 36:7, 36:11, 36:16, 38:3, 38:8, 40:4, 40:10, 46:6, 46:13, 51:3, 51:8, 51:9, 51:12, 51:16, 51:22, 55:20, 56:21, 58:11, 58:17, 59:12,

60:24, 61:21, 62:3,

62:6, 62:8, 62:12, 62:14, 63:21, 63:22, 65:6, 65:24, 67:20, 78:6, 79:3, 79:9, 79:16, 79:19, 81:2 permits [5] - 4:6, 4:8, 13:1, 62:23, 67:13 permitted [1] - 79:6 permitting [4] - 9:22, 65:9, 69:18, 71:9 persons [2] - 49:14, perspective [1] -56:18 pertains [2] - 11:18, 11:22 petition [1] - 35:8 PHMSA [27] - 16:13, 16:17, 19:23, 22:25, 23:6. 23:25. 39:5. 39:14, 39:19, 39:24, 41:25, 42:11, 53:22, 54:1, 54:4, 54:6, 54:10, 54:11, 55:4, 55:5, 55:9, 55:12. 76:12. 76:14. 76:22. 78:14 PHMSA's [1] - 23:10 phone [2] - 5:20, 5:21 phones [1] - 5:20 phrases [1] - 57:3 physical [1] - 63:1 pills [1] - 72:20 Pioneer [1] - 5:10 **Pipeline** [1] - 39:5 pipeline [51] - 3:3, 9:22, 10:2, 10:5, 13:19, 18:3, 18:17, 20:24, 21:3, 21:7, 23:5, 23:14, 23:17, 23:19, 34:9, 34:14, 34:18, 35:16, 36:7, 36:8, 36:17, 38:24, 39:2, 39:9, 40:14, 41:4, 41:5, 41:16, 42:3, 43:10, 43:12, 46:6, 47:11, 48:3, 48:12, 52:7, 52:18, 52:19, 55:11, 60:15, 61:20, 64:16, 65:19, 67:2, 68:5, 70:18, 71:5, 71:8, 71:19, 78:13, 80:16 pipelines [37] - 10:1, 17:10, 17:12, 17:25, 20:18, 20:19, 20:23, 21:4, 21:5, 21:9, 21:16, 23:14, 29:25, 38:15, 38:16, 38:18, 38:19, 53:20, 54:2, 54:9, 54:12, 54:20, 54:22, 54:23, 54:24,

69:20, 72:25, 73:2, 77:3, 77:6, 77:12, 77:14 place [8] - 5:7, 31:7, 41:16, 46:19, 51:17, 63:7, 71:5, 74:12 placement [1] - 39:17 plain [8] - 10:12, 14:22, 24:10, 25:10, 27:9, 27:16, 31:3, 31.20 plan [6] - 34:16, 34:17, 38:23, 41:8, 49:19, 77:21 planning [2] - 34:22, 77:21 plans [1] - 38:22 plant [3] - 13:16, 65:19, 66:23 PO [1] - 6:13 point [36] - 3:9, 3:20, 4:12, 14:25, 19:16, 20:14, 21:1, 21:22, 22:17, 22:23, 24:4, 25:1, 33:7, 36:17, 37:3, 37:6, 40:7, 44:2, 46:1, 46:6, 46:11, 46:15, 46:16, 50:19, 50:25, 55:19, 57:8, 59:15, 65:18, 65:23, 66:21, 66:23, 66:24, 68:23, 74:21, 80:25 pointed [1] - 61:18 points [1] - 62:24 poison [1] - 72:20 policies [6] - 48:19, 70:20, 70:22, 70:24, 71:10, 71:18 policy [18] - 9:13, 9:18, 10:11, 17:6, 17:19, 18:5, 48:19, 48:21, 49:5, 53:8, 53:11, 63:17, 70:16, 72:24, 73:1, 73:14, 73:18, 81:8 political [8] - 24:18, 24:23, 26:5, 38:2, 38:4, 67:3, 71:6, 76:15 Porter [1] - 60:17 portions [1] - 39:25 poses [1] - 22:18 position [5] - 9:25, 14:22, 40:8, 52:21, 76:17 possibilities [1] -66:11 possible [4] - 26:24, 70:3, 73:3, 76:15 post [1] - 81:2 post-granting [1] -

potential [3] - 69:24, 77:13 potentially [3] - 66:21, 69:20 70:12 power [4] - 50:16, 50:22, 66:4, 79:16 powers [2] - 23:11, 77:1 Pranis [8] - 8:5, 8:10, 64:10, 71:22, 74:2, 74:8, 74:16, 77:17 PRANIS [4] - 8:9, 64:11, 72:4, 72:17 precedence [1] -16:24 precedent [1] - 16:11 preceding [1] - 81:3 precisely [1] - 23:8 predictable [1] - 77:24 preempt [16] - 4:8, 11:20, 12:3, 13:1, 14:12, 24:17, 24:22, 32:4, 32:6, 54:1, 60:13, 60:24, 63:22, 79:18, 80:9, 81:11 preempted [20] - 5:25, 12:12, 13:11, 13:12, 16:11, 17:1, 18:13, 18:14, 23:18, 26:14, 26:15, 26:17, 27:4, 27:6, 37:8, 62:16, 73:20, 76:4, 78:22 preempting [3] -35:19, 75:19, 79:21 preemption [13] -10:15, 10:25, 13:4, 14:10, 14:23, 16:4, 19:9, 25:9, 26:20, 55:8, 75:9, 78:19, 79:14 preemptive [1] - 79:16 preempts [6] - 11:23, 18:10, 36:13, 53:18, 61:23, 65:25 preference [1] - 82:2 preliminary [1] - 8:23 premature [6] - 46:2, 47:9, 49:5, 51:5, 55:15, 80:10 prematurity [1] - 80:7 prepare [1] - 41:9 prepared [1] - 41:18 preponderance [6] -24:24, 25:25, 28:6, 37:22, 38:5, 68:6 prerogative [1] - 24:1 prerogatives [1] -23:15 present [1] - 8:1 presentation [1] -8:21 presentations [1] -8:19

55:1, 55:11, 65:10,

81:2

## December 21, 2023, Formal Hearing ND PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

really [6] - 4:12, 20:1.

37:19, 47:8, 47:21,

26:21, 51:7, 74:21

reasonable [5] - 17:9,

68:8, 70:18, 70:19,

55:15, 67:22, 74:16,

reasons [8] - 18:5, 46:3, 46:4, 46:18,

received [1] - 9:2

recent [2] - 18:4,

recently [1] - 55:6

referring [4] - 7:5,

25:3, 25:14, 31:14

regulating [5] - 22:3,

recognize [2] - 23:7,

reason [4] - 8:7,

74:12

75:21

75:13

80:18

50:14

presented [3] - 10:20, 15:3, 47:19 preservation [1] -48.24 preserving [1] - 65:8 pretty [5] - 9:4, 11:11, 33:13, 66:10, 72:24 prevails [1] - 80:15 prevent [2] - 17:4, 71:11 preventing [1] - 22:10 previous [3] - 3:21, 29:24, 30:1 previously [4] - 32:2, 48:6, 49:10, 59:17 primacy [1] - 9:16 primarily [1] - 71:7 primary [2] - 14:22, 46:4 printed [3] - 56:12, 57:21, 58:9 printout [2] - 57:10, 57:21 **priorities** [1] - 67:23 problem [1] - 22:18 problems [1] - 62:4 procedural [1] - 5:15 procedure [2] - 7:23, 51.13 procedures [5] - 10:6, 34:17, 38:22, 49:12, 50:7 proceed [3] - 18:25, 33:23, 55:17 proceeding [4] - 5:25, 10:17, 65:4, 68:1 proceedings [1] - 5:17 process [18] - 22:6, 22:17, 22:19, 32:16, 59:6, 59:7, 59:13, 59:21, 60:20, 61:1, 63:4, 63:13, 63:21, 65:9, 67:17, 71:8, 76:6 processes [4] - 18:2, 61:3, 80:9, 80:11 processing [2] -65:18, 66:22 produce [2] - 47:1, 47:13 produced [1] - 28:3 proffered [2] - 28:3, 29:12 prohibit [1] - 17:9 prohibited [1] - 72:7 prohibiting [2] -17:12, 72:9 prohibits [1] - 79:20 project [14] - 10:5, 15:25, 16:21, 17:5, 17:20, 18:16, 43:8, 47:4, 64:19, 65:6, 69:9, 73:7, 77:22,

77:25 projects [4] - 13:21, 17:25, 67:2, 69:7 promote [2] - 10:11, 53:13 promoting [1] - 53:8 promotion [1] - 9:14 promptly [1] - 74:9 proof [2] - 28:5, 46:25 proper [1] - 34:21 properties [2] - 50:17, 50:23 property [2] - 23:13, 77:3 propose [1] - 73:14 proposed [6] - 37:1, 43:10, 47:11, 58:2, 65:6, 66:12 proposing [1] - 48:11 protecting [2] - 68:15, 77:8 protocol [2] - 34:18, 41:8

41:8 protocols [3] - 38:23, 49:12, 50:7 proud [1] - 3:10 prove [2] - 28:6, 68:8 provide [8] - 8:15, 11:13, 17:22, 26:6, 26:10, 34:10, 50:6, 67:12 provided [17] - 7:24,

25:12, 25:18, 25:19, 36:10, 37:13, 47:15, 47:18, 49:23, 55:7, 56:10, 58:3, 61:10, 61:21, 63:11, 66:1, 67:25

provides [7] - 10:13, 17:23, 18:9, 46:13, 47:21, 61:12, 69:16

providing [1] - 49:12

provision [3] - 20:13, 46:9, 75:8 provisions [2] - 27:17, 46:20 proximity [1] - 17:17

proxy [2] - 16:25, 78:21 prudent [1] - 21:8 PSC [5] - 28:4, 59:25, 60:1, 60:3, 60:7 PSC's [1] - 49:16 PU-22-391 [1] - 5:9 public [5] - 52:4,

53:12, 62:25, 73:21, 81:8 **Public** [7] - 5:8, 5:14, 6:3, 7:1, 9:24, 17:24, 65:14

publicizing [1] - 48:4 pull [1] - 44:4 purport [1] - 18:16

purports [1] - 16:15 purpose [4] - 16:7, 16:8, 16:20, 21:13 purposes [1] - 66:18 Purposes [1] - 16:6 pursuant [1] - 37:13 purview [2] - 20:17, 68:13 put [9] - 28:22, 45:1, 52:6, 52:9, 52:11, 52:18, 53:16, 71:15, 71:16 puts [2] - 34:15, 67:10 putting [4] - 32:19, 33:7, 68:12, 78:2 puzzle [1] - 18:1

#### Q

recognized [1] - 23:25 recognizes [2] questions [24] - 8:20, 66:18, 77:10 8:21, 11:4, 18:19, reconsideration [2] -18:21, 18:23, 29:16, 15:3, 81:10 29:19, 33:19, 33:20, record [12] - 5:5, 6:8, 40:16, 40:18, 45:12, 6:10, 6:23, 8:8, 45:15, 45:16, 55:22, 10:19, 28:14, 28:17, 56:1, 64:1, 64:4, 29:13, 68:24, 70:15, 64:7, 71:23, 75:15, 82:5 80:1, 81:15 recreation [1] - 21:19 quick [1] - 43:4 refer [6] - 9:11, 23:22, quickly [1] - 78:25 24:7, 25:4, 25:23, quite [2] - 80:18 31:10 quote [7] - 12:4, reference [2] - 24:13, 14:16, 14:17, 27:12, 45:5, 46:13, 53:12 referred [5] - 23:2, quotes [1] - 17:3 25:6, 40:23, 41:10, quoting [1] - 30:15 72:3

#### R

refers [7] - 24:19, 25:5, 25:13, 25:19, raised [2] - 46:1, 75:6 25:23, 31:8, 32:14 Ranch [1] - 48:14 reflect [1] - 5:5 Randall [1] - 7:4 refusing [1] - 62:5 Randy [1] - 3:3 regard [3] - 14:24, rather [3] - 18:6, 54:7, 80:19 67:14, 73:24 regarding [9] - 9:22, reached [3] - 8:18, 10:1, 10:15, 12:9, 17:15, 82:3 38:16, 38:20, 41:13, read [17] - 12:20, 64:24, 75:18 12:25, 13:14, 14:8, regardless [1] - 49:2 24:21, 30:20, 31:3, regulate [16] - 16:15, 44:23, 48:16, 48:20, 16:20, 21:5, 21:8, 54:6, 58:22, 61:13, 21:9, 21:11, 23:12, 61:15, 62:13, 76:14 23:17, 23:24, 34:13, reading [12] - 24:10, 41:3, 50:16, 50:23, 31:20, 50:18, 61:25, 54:19, 77:1, 77:5 63:2, 65:16, 81:3, regulated [6] - 20:17, 81:5, 81:6, 81:7, 20:18, 21:13, 21:18, 21:23, 22:4 reads [3] - 11:11, regulates [4] - 20:5, 13:6, 44:24 21:15, 38:24, 78:12 real [2] - 43:4, 78:7

23:19, 53:18, 77:12 regulation [7] - 16:9, 22:1, 23:25, 25:21, 25:22, 62:15, 80:16 regulations [37] - 4:9, 11:21, 14:16, 16:13, 16:17, 16:25, 17:9, 18:11, 24:24, 25:2, 25:5, 25:6, 25:24, 31:5, 31:13, 31:15, 36:14, 37:6, 37:8, 37:15, 37:23, 38:5, 39:8, 39:10, 39:23, 39:24, 40:6, 40:12, 42:16, 60:5, 60:7, 60:14, 61:24, 66:1, 66:2, 75:14 **Regulatory** [1] - 54:18 regulatory [1] - 77:23 reiterate [1] - 77:17 related [1] - 20:22 relates [2] - 19:22, 39:2 relation [1] - 48:14 release [2] - 50:2, 82:3 relevant [2] - 79:13, 80:17 reliable [1] - 65:11 relies [1] - 77:19 rely [3] - 46:9, 46:12, remainder [2] - 10:17, 25:15 remaining [2] - 39:20, 39:25 remains [1] - 14:22 remarks [1] - 81:23 remember [1] - 42:25

removed [1] - 32:1 render [1] - 10:2 rendered [1] - 75:8 renders [1] - 74:20 renewed [2] - 5:23, 10:14 repeat [2] - 74:6, 74:8 repeatedly [2] - 16:5, 76:21 replies [1] - 8:22 reply [3] - 8:15, 17:4,

remote [1] - 52:19

remove [1] - 10:18

represent [1] - 6:11 representative [1] -60:12

Representative [1] -14:5 represented [1] - 6:1 representing [1] -33:25

represents [1] - 65:7 request [8] - 5:14, 6:2,

### December 21, 2023, Formal Hearing ND PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

46:2, 46:5, 46:15, 49:12, 50:7, 55:19 requested [2] - 48:6, 79:2 requesting [1] - 55:16 require [7] - 10:19, 12:3, 27:20, 28:22, 38:1, 41:15, 69:4 required [5] - 28:4, 29:13, 37:4, 62:23, 75.7 requirement [2] -30:17, 66:9 requirements [25] -12:11, 12:14, 12:25, 24:12, 24:17, 24:22, 25:1, 25:4, 26:7, 26:9, 26:11, 26:12, 26:13. 31:4. 37:5. 37:12, 38:3, 41:14, 46:11, 46:19, 52:3, 66:7, 67:15, 71:4 requires [5] - 12:10, 13:4, 41:17, 63:13, 67:13 reroute [8] - 35:16, 47:11, 47:17, 47:20, 47:23, 48:3, 48:9, 48:11 residence [2] - 22:8, 30:11 residences [3] - 30:6, 42:24, 74:15 resident [1] - 43:7 residential [2] - 51:18, 52:10 residents [2] - 68:16, 69:12 resistance [1] - 14:18 resolving [1] - 10:16 resources [3] - 9:16, 48:25, 65:12 respect [5] - 19:11, 27:8, 32:15, 66:4, 67:12 respectful [1] - 3:17 respectfully [2] - 3:15, respects [1] - 47:23 respond [4] - 41:6, 41:14, 55:23, 74:10 responded [1] - 17:16 responders [2] -34:11, 34:19 **Response** [1] - 49:25 response [6] - 34:16, 49:19, 49:23, 59:3, 61:16, 62:17 responses [1] - 14:21 responsibilities [1] -9:21 responsibility [3] -54:23, 65:13, 67:9

responsible [2] - 3:19, 42:12 rest [2] - 15:2, 24:21 restrict [1] - 38:18 restricting [1] - 23:4 restriction [1] - 15:18 restrictions [1] - 80:4 restrictive [16] -14:16, 15:12, 24:25, 28:7, 28:25, 30:24, 32:9, 37:24, 38:6, 66:9, 70:20, 70:22, 70:24, 72:25, 77:20, 81:11 rests [1] - 54:24 retain [1] - 35:7 retained [1] - 36:25 return [1] - 74:3 reversible [1] - 28:11 review [1] - 46:24 rights [1] - 23:5 rigorous [1] - 71:3 risk [1] - 71:19 road [26] - 12:5, 13:7, 24:13, 24:19, 25:4, 25:23, 26:10, 30:23, 31:8, 31:10, 31:12, 32:7, 32:13, 32:14, 38:1, 62:20, 62:22, 62:23, 62:24, 62:25, 63:2, 63:5, 74:25, 75:2, 75:11 role [3] - 67:11, 77:7, 77:9 Room [1] - 5:10 room [1] - 9:3 Rose [1] - 78:18 route [24] - 13:20, 17:14, 17:21, 21:9, 22:11, 22:19, 48:5, 48:10, 48:22, 49:4, 52:23, 52:24, 56:21, 56:22, 57:18, 58:18, 67:19, 67:20, 70:9, 71:19, 73:9, 79:2, 80:1 routes [4] - 48:25, 52:14 66:20 67:2 routing [4] - 64:25, 66:7, 69:2, 69:19 rubber [1] - 69:7 rug [1] - 74:13 rule [3] - 15:5, 64:24, 80:14 Rule [3] - 34:8, 34:24, 41.12 rules [7] - 15:25, 18:2, 60:4. 63:1. 63:24. 65:22, 70:23 ruling [2] - 10:21, 10:23

78:6

run-of-the-mill [1] -S safe [2] - 41:5, 42:7 safely [1] - 42:9 safety [40] - 16:7, 41:1, 41:3, 41:5, 78:21 Safety [1] - 39:6 salvage [1] - 21:20 sausage [1] - 32:18 scenario [1] - 72:2 Schock [1] - 7:2 **SCS** [3] - 5:23, 8:1, 9:11 second [6] - 15:4, 57:2, 67:19 Section [2] - 16:14, section [27] - 11:17, 81:1, 81:2 68:4 secure [1] - 73:12 security [1] - 78:20 see [18] - 3:21, 9:12, 78:21 seeing [2] - 71:9, 75:13 seem [1] - 61:14 run [3] - 3:19, 14:14, sees [1] - 78:9

select [1] - 49:4 selected [1] - 48:25 sense [9] - 13:13, running [2] - 3:11, 5:1 13:15, 13:22, 27:2, 27:3. 27:18. 28:1. 52:6, 61:14 sent [3] - 19:24, 22:25, 39:5 sentence [9] - 24:16, 24:19, 24:21, 25:3, 16:9, 16:20, 16:25, 56:19, 57:2, 58:4, 21:25, 23:15, 23:17, 61:7, 62:20 23:19, 23:24, 34:10, sentences [1] - 26:5 34:14, 34:17, 38:22, separate [2] - 12:21, 38:24, 39:2, 39:8, 74:22 September [2] - 47:21, 41:8, 41:13, 42:2, 54:5 42:5, 42:11, 42:15, sequestered [1] - 9:20 49:12, 50:6, 52:1, sequestration [2] -52:4, 52:20, 54:17, 9:15, 53:8 76:22, 77:8, 78:10, series [2] - 16:23, 78:12, 78:19, 78:20, 77:22 serious [1] - 32:19 seriously [1] - 71:14 serve [4] - 5:15, 16:20, 17:2, 17:20 saw [2] - 19:20, 20:24 Service [6] - 5:8, 5:14, 6:3, 9:24, 17:24, 65:14 session [1] - 31:25 set [6] - 5:7, 7:23, 13:10, 22:6, 70:23, 24:16, 35:1, 44:17, 71:17 setback [10] - 15:9, Secretary [1] - 42:16 15:15, 22:9, 22:15, 23:12, 29:25, 30:6, 30:10, 42:24, 77:2 setbacks [21] - 15:17, 13:13, 16:6, 25:12, 15:20, 16:18, 16:24, 25:13, 25:15, 25:16, 17:2, 20:13, 22:9, 25:18, 25:19, 30:25, 22:11, 22:15, 22:18, 31:23, 31:25, 32:7, 23:6, 39:1, 39:10, 36:11, 39:16, 43:8, 42:1, 42:4, 42:9, 43:18, 44:21, 44:24, 42:15, 54:1, 62:25, 57:9, 57:11, 57:14, 71:1, 72:22 61:21, 62:21, 63:2, setting [1] - 6:5 several [4] - 16:6, sections [2] - 31:24, 24:4, 41:1, 44:22 **shall** [5] - 26:6, 36:24, 37:12, 38:1, 58:6 share [4] - 34:15, 41:17, 56:17, 58:20 23:21, 32:21, 41:1, sharing [2] - 34:9, 41:20, 45:1, 45:14, 38:21 48:2, 48:7, 49:17, Shaw [2] - 50:25, 56:18, 57:13, 61:7, 51:15 61:10, 62:13, 63:19, Sheri [1] - 3:4 ship [1] - 20:25 shippers [1] - 68:21 short [2] - 9:12, 32:17 seek [2] - 10:4, 10:23 show [7] - 17:4, 28:7, 28:8, 37:22, 47:1,

showing [3] - 25:25, showings [1] - 12:5 shown [2] - 28:19, 69:11 shows [8] - 24:23, 35:9, 38:4, 47:17, 48:13, 52:13, 70:15, 80:4 **shut** [1] - 16:15 shut-off [1] - 16:15 side [4] - 14:2, 43:24, 48:3, 80:2 sides [4] - 4:14, 27:11, 33:1, 33:12 signed [1] - 11:9 significant [3] - 9:15, 28:13, 30:10 significantly [1] -21:14 signs [1] - 3:14 silenced [1] - 5:21 Silver [1] - 48:14 similar [4] - 23:6, 66:3, 70:2, 76:18 similarly [3] - 13:3, 21:6, 70:22 simple [3] - 64:13, 64:14, 72:12 simply [15] - 12:8, 20:23, 21:22, 22:1, 22:11, 23:22, 28:1, 28:14, 29:9, 30:11, 46:7, 68:5, 74:22, 78:21, 79:3 single [3] - 13:17, 18:2, 71:8 site [32] - 13:17, 35:24, 36:18, 37:9, 38:9, 40:3, 40:10, 40:11, 40:13, 40:14, 46:7, 46:16, 48:22, 49:13, 50:8, 56:20, 56:22, 57:15, 57:19, 58:1, 58:5, 58:7, 58:8, 60:23, 61:8, 65:21, 67:6, 70:18, 71:4, 73:1 sited [1] - 54:12 sites [2] - 48:25, 66:21 siting [9] - 17:25, 18:6, 20:6, 54:20, 54:21, 54:23, 66:5, 67:9, 69:2 siting's [1] - 71:5 sitting [1] - 7:19 situation [3] - 20:21, 38:11, 79:21 skip [3] - 57:24, 58:4, 61:16 slippery [1] - 69:17 slope [1] - 69:17 slurry [3] - 20:20,

47:4, 68:10

### December 21, 2023, Formal Hearing ND PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

21:2, 21:4 small [1] - 48:10 smaller [1] - 16:24 smallest [1] - 68:25 snippets [1] - 14:2 **so..** [1] - 9:4 socioeconomic [1] -68:21 sole [2] - 56:22, 76:22 solely [1] - 65:13 solution [2] - 10:14, 78:8 someone [2] - 51:17, 65:7 sometimes [2] -13:11, 75:17 somewhere [1] - 43:6 sort [6] - 18:8, 21:25, 71:15, 74:24, 78:24, sorts [1] - 71:10 sound [1] - 75:20 **sources** [1] - 50:2 **spacing** [2] - 16:15, 39.18 special [6] - 51:3, 51:8, 51:9, 51:11, 51:16, 51:22 Special [1] - 6:24 specialized [1] - 81:5 specific [14] - 4:5, 10:1, 16:16, 20:1, 38:15, 49:21, 57:22, 58:18, 58:22, 59:1, 78:20, 80:15, 80:16, 80.18 specifically [15] -11:18, 19:3, 19:9, 20:12, 20:14, 20:22, 23:1, 24:1, 26:4, 28:16, 39:6, 42:21, 55:9, 55:13, 65:10 spectrum [3] - 42:17, 75:1, 75:2 speculate [1] - 33:4 spend [1] - 19:4 spending [1] - 19:5 spent [1] - 66:25 **split** [1] - 30:9 splits [1] - 30:5 spur [1] - 75:14 stable [1] - 77:24 stamp [1] - 69:7 stand [1] - 29:16 standard [4] - 15:10, 15:15, 51:19, 78:20 standards [5] - 10:6, 10:10, 14:15, 42:3, start [6] - 9:7, 12:23, 19:2, 44:19, 71:1, 77:25

started [3] - 3:7, 8:24, starting [1] - 44:22 starts [1] - 25:11 State [5] - 5:10, 9:15, 10:7, 17:7, 66:18 state [38] - 6:7, 6:10, 6:22, 7:13, 8:8, 9:13, 9:16, 10:11, 14:17, 15:10, 15:15, 17:5, 17:8, 17:13, 17:19, 17:22, 18:17, 23:16, 28:21, 42:2, 48:21, 50:13, 53:6, 53:7, 53:17, 53:21, 54:8, 54:13, 55:1, 55:10, 64:17, 64:24, 65:9, 69:18, 71:9, 76:3, 81:7 state-based [1] -69:18 state-permitting [1] -65:9 statement [4] - 42:2, 48:18, 49:4, 53:12 states [7] - 9:21, 16:6, 23:10. 26:12. 54:25. 76:9, 76:23 statewide [2] - 9:25, status [1] - 13:11 statute [45] - 10:24, 12:20, 13:2, 19:6, 24:5, 24:10, 27:14, 31:3, 31:7, 31:20, 32:22, 33:6, 35:20, 35:23, 49:8, 49:9, 49:11, 51:24, 53:11, 53:19, 56:15, 56:19, 56:24, 56:25, 57:2, 57:3, 57:6, 57:22, 57:24, 58:10, 58:14, 59:4, 59:7, 59:8, 61:11, 63:3, 63:13, 63:18, 63:19, 68:5, 75:5, 75:23, 76:1, 80:17 statutes [4] - 48:20, 50:13, 56:12, 60:19 statutory [10] - 11:2, 19:5, 24:3, 24:9, 27:6, 50:16, 50:22, 74:17, 75:3, 80:14 steer [1] - 15:1 step [11] - 47:8, 51:22, 59:5, 59:6, 59:7, 59:13, 59:20, 60:19, 60:22, 60:24, 63:4 steps [1] - 12:15 Steve [1] - 7:10 still [9] - 22:2, 35:14, 39:25, 49:3, 64:21,

76:7, 76:22, 76:23

stopping [1] - 29:8 storage [2] - 9:17, 53:13 Story [1] - 41:20 straight [1] - 61:2 Strategy [1] - 49:25 strictly [1] - 79:23 stringent [1] - 78:5 structure [3] - 13:15, 15:14, 75:5 structured [1] - 76:10 structures [2] - 15:9, 30:1 study [1] - 58:2 stuff [2] - 3:14, 60:25 sub [1] - 60:21 subdivision [18] -20:9, 24:16, 24:18, 24:23, 25:7, 25:9, 25:11, 25:14, 25:17, 25:20, 26:4, 26:6, 26:16, 26:19, 26:21, 37:13, 38:2, 38:4 subject [4] - 12:5, 17:9, 35:10, 63:23 subjects [1] - 16:16 submit [1] - 75:7 submitted [7] - 28:3, 28:25, 37:16, 38:13, 47:12, 47:21, 48:1 subpart [11] - 55:18, 58:5, 58:16, 59:16, 61:13, 61:17, 61:20, 62:6, 62:18, 63:10 subsection [15] -11:17, 13:14, 24:12, 26:8, 32:13, 36:2, 36:10, 37:11, 39:16, 39:23, 44:21, 46:12, 46:20, 55:18 subsequently [1] -62:3 subset [1] - 81:5 substantive [3] -11:14, 12:8, 13:10 subsurface [1] - 21:20 sudden [1] - 72:6 suddenly [1] - 70:1 **sufficient** [1] - 29:13 suggest [4] - 11:12, 53:17, 78:14, 78:15 suggested [1] - 61:15 suggestion [1] - 79:1 suggests [1] - 14:6 suitable [1] - 66:21 summarize [1] - 7:25 Summit [61] - 3:2, 8:15, 9:11, 10:5, 10:12, 10:14, 10:23, 10:24, 11:12, 14:6, 14:12, 14:19, 14:21, 15:4, 15:10, 16:22, 17:14, 17:16, 18:12,

19:13, 19:21, 22:1, 22:7, 22:14, 23:10, 24:11, 25:8, 27:8, 28:3, 28:22, 28:25, 29:11, 30:16, 33:11, 34:4, 35:16, 38:25, 41:10, 41:15, 41:20, 46:6, 46:23, 46:25, 48:4, 49:16, 49:18, 50:12, 50:20, 51:4, 52:6, 53:19, 54:5, 54:16, 55:7, 61:15, 63:16, 63:17, 64:22, 65:6, 76:16, 77:17 Summit's [9] - 13:9, 14:22, 15:24, 22:4, 29:15, 62:18, 64:19, 81:7, 81:8 supercedes [1] -53:18 superfluous [4] -25:9, 26:18, 74:21, 75:8 supersede [14] - 4:8, 4:9, 24:17, 24:22, 27:24, 27:25, 28:16, 28:17, 29:14, 32:3, 32:6, 38:3, 60:24, 61.9 superseded [23] -5:25, 12:14, 12:16, 12:17, 25:18, 25:22, 26:14, 26:15, 26:17, 26:24, 27:2, 27:4, 27:5, 27:22, 28:23, 30:19, 37:8, 37:14, 37:19, 37:20, 40:2, 62:15, 63:11 supersedes [3] -36:13, 61:23, 65:25 superseding [3] -34:4, 35:18, 40:5 supersession [1] -19.8 supplemental [1] -16:21 support [5] - 17:21, 18:7, 64:19, 64:20, 64:23 supported [1] - 60:19 supportive [1] - 76:17 supports [3] - 26:3, 27:10, 81:7 supposed [1] - 50:6 Supreme [1] - 50:24 surface [2] - 21:21, sweep [3] - 19:14, 23:23, 74:13 sympathize [1] - 67:5

31.5 system [2] - 69:18, 77:19 systems [3] - 9:18, 9:19, 65:11 Т tab [7] - 56:15, 56:24, 57:10, 57:21, 58:9, 61:11, 62:22 tactic [1] - 49:23 talks [8] - 16:7, 35:20, 39:17, 50:12, 56:20, 57:1, 58:17, 77:7 targeted [1] - 22:1 TC [1] - 76:19 Technical [1] - 57:3 template [1] - 49:24 ten [11] - 12:11, 26:13, 26:17, 27:23, 30:18, 30:21, 37:4, 43:1, 43:3, 70:7, 80:21 tend [1] - 19:13 term [4] - 12:11, 16:13, 61:19, 74:25 terms [3] - 47:20, 58:22, 68:15 test [1] - 70:16 testify [1] - 22:13 testimony [3] - 59:22, 67:24, 67:25 theory [1] - 32:5 therefore [2] - 31:16, 54:23 they've [4] - 23:3, 50:2. 51:7. 51:11 thinking [1] - 70:13 thinks [1] - 55:4 third [3] - 54:17, 57:9, 59:23 three [3] - 11:13, 12:7, 13:10 threshold [2] - 46:21, throughout [3] - 7:13, 34:24, 52:11 Tim [1] - 3:5 timeline [1] - 37:7 timely [1] - 46:2 timing [1] - 72:21 today [14] - 3:8, 4:5, 5:9, 5:22, 6:10, 6:19, 47:15, 56:16, 64:15, 64:18, 64:23, 65:4, 81:22, 82:6 today's [2] - 6:5, 7:24 together [6] - 13:14, 27:17, 27:18, 31:4, synonymous [1] -41:2, 48:20

top [1] - 20:15

topic [1] - 4:5

25:1

synonymously [1] -

### December 21, 2023, Formal Hearing ND PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

tourist [1] - 21:19 township [11] - 35:6, 43:10, 43:16, 43:17, 43:19. 43:20. 43:21. 43:23, 60:6, 70:5, 72:4 Township [1] - 69:25 townships [12] - 35:7, 35:9, 35:12, 36:25, 42:22, 43:9, 43:13, 52:13, 52:14, 52:18, 53:1, 70:23 track [1] - 68:24 tradition [1] - 3:16 traditional [3] - 23:15, 52:6, 77:5 traditionally [2] -23:11, 77:1 trailer [1] - 21:20 train [1] - 34:11 training [1] - 34:22 transmission [33] -4:7, 9:18, 11:22, 12:2, 12:9, 12:24, 13:1, 14:24, 15:17, 17:25, 18:10, 20:18, 20:19, 21:16, 22:3, 36:3, 36:12, 36:24, 43:3, 45:3, 45:9, 48:23, 53:15, 54:20, 58:12, 61:22, 63:10, 65:10, 66:7, 67:13, 69:20, 69:22, 79:19 **Transport** [3] - 5:23, 8:1, 9:11 Transportation's [1] -42:17 treat [2] - 13:22, 18:16 treated [1] - 11:14 true [1] - 80:12 trump [1] - 55:5 try [7] - 32:21, 64:13, 71:18, 74:6, 74:8, 74:13 Trygg [3] - 69:25, 72:3 trying [7] - 29:9, 46:10, 48:13, 60:9, 67:1, 71:8, 76:15 turn [4] - 3:18, 5:3, 9:6, 30:17 turned [3] - 5:21, 30:21, 67:3 two [34] - 10:3, 14:21, 15:13, 15:21, 26:5, 32:17, 32:25, 34:2, 35:21, 36:5, 40:22, 42:6, 42:14, 43:6, 43:12, 43:18, 43:23, 47:15, 53:3, 58:14, 59:1, 59:5, 59:6, 59:7, 59:13, 59:20, 60:19, 60:21, 60:24, 63:4, 63:20, 66:10,

68:4, 80:2 two-step [7] - 59:5, 59:6, 59:7, 59:13, 59:20, 60:19, 63:4 twofold [1] - 72:18 types [1] - 72:25

#### U

ultimate [1] - 75:16

ultimately [4] - 33:15,

66:13, 66:15, 67:10

under [29] - 3:24, 4:16,

21:24, 26:7, 26:15,

34:7, 34:23, 35:23,

36:1, 36:2, 36:10, 36:22, 39:16, 41:12, 50:14, 51:14, 53:3, 56:24, 57:9, 57:13, 57:21, 59:7, 59:16, 62:21, 63:7, 63:10, 74:13, 78:6, 82:2 undermine [1] - 17:19 understood [1] -30:15 underway [1] - 15:25 unduly [6] - 66:2, 66:9, 68:11, 70:14, 70:15 unenforceable [1] -42.15 UNIDENTIFIED [1] -56:3 unified [1] - 18:17 uniform [1] - 18:17 Union [3] - 8:4, 64:9, 64:12 unique [5] - 10:1, 19:17, 29:11, 74:11, 74.24 unless [3] - 40:15, 55:22, 61:14 unnatural [1] - 81:3 unquote [1] - 46:14 unreasonable [3] -15:18, 16:1, 76:8 unreasonableness [1] - 15:6 unreasonably [11] -14:16, 15:11, 24:25, 28:7, 28:25, 30:24, 32:9, 37:24, 38:6, 77:20, 81:11 unusual [2] - 16:18, 76:9 up [25] - 8:19, 19:14, 22:6, 23:23, 30:9, 32:25, 34:3, 39:11, 43:15, 44:4, 44:15, 54:7, 54:13, 55:9, 55:10, 60:18, 71:5, 74:7, 75:22, 76:12,

77:9, 78:24, 79:25 upfront [1] - 10:16 upstairs [1] - 9:2 uses [5] - 20:6, 21:13, 21:16, 21:18, 21:23 **Utilities** [1] - 7:1 utilities [1] - 76:7

#### V

value [2] - 4:1, 4:2 valves [3] - 16:15, 39:17, 39:18 variance [2] - 51:13, 78:3 variances [3] - 77:18, 77:20, 77:22 various [3] - 10:9, 23:3, 33:13 verbatim [1] - 76:18 verbose [1] - 24:5 version [1] - 47:25 versus [1] - 4:1 vested [1] - 65:13 veto [3] - 17:20, 66:12, 69:19 VI [5] - 9:17, 20:9, 21:15, 21:19 vicinity [3] - 23:14, 77:3 77:6 Victor [1] - 7:2 view [2] - 9:25, 65:7 viewed [1] - 13:20 visual [1] - 56:13 vital [1] - 65:11 voluntary [1] - 17:15 vote [1] - 11:8

47:14 white [2] - 52:13, 69:24 whole [5] - 13:13, 13:20, 31:23, 32:2, 46:9 wide [1] - 11:20 willing [1] - 69:4 wind [2] - 66:6, 66:22 wish [1] - 8:16 witnesses [1] - 11:5 word [1] - 24:12 words [11] - 11:3, 13:24, 25:12, 27:16, 31:5, 51:20, 57:3, 57:17, 58:22, 68:7, 72:21 wordy [1] - 24:5 workers [1] - 65:7 works [4] - 27:7, 59:21, 73:18, 74:24 worms [1] - 71:16 worst [1] - 14:11 wrap [1] - 8:19 wrapped [1] - 15:2 writing [1] - 78:2 written [2] - 63:15, 76:18

weighed [1] - 67:18

welfare [2] - 47:2,

#### Υ

year [1] - 10:4 years [2] - 58:14, 66:25 yelling [1] - 3:14 yourself [1] - 72:14

#### W

W201 [1] - 69:16 Wachter [1] - 7:6 wait [1] - 60:12 waive [1] - 73:14 waiver [5] - 22:9, 72:9, 73:4, 73:19, 78:3 waivers [6] - 22:7, 22:16, 29:7, 77:18, 77:19, 77:22 walk [1] - 24:8 wants [2] - 28:23, 57:1 Warford [9] - 7:6, 47:16, 47:17, 48:2, 49:10, 49:15, 49:16, 49:22 warnings [1] - 58:21 wasted [1] - 10:21 water [2] - 20:19, 30:8 waving [1] - 3:14 weaponized [1] -71:10

#### Ζ

Zachary [1] - 6:25 zones [2] - 16:7, 16:8 zoning [46] - 4:8, 11:21, 11:24, 14:24, 23:5, 25:6, 25:24, 26:9, 31:14, 31:15, 35:3, 35:5, 35:7, 35:10, 35:11, 35:13, 35:15, 35:19, 36:14, 36:25, 37:6, 37:8, 38:12, 38:14, 38:16, 38:17, 39:1, 39:10, 39:12, 39:16, 39:20, 40:1, 40:6, 40:10, 40:12, 43:19, 52:2, 52:5, 52:8, 60:6, 60:14, 60:15, 60:16, 61:24, 65:25, 67:14